Ex-Im's impact is felt throughout America and affects companies of every size, but the Bank's positive impact is particularly strong on small businesses. Ninety percent of the total number of Ex-Im Bank supported transactions in fiscal year 2001 was in direct support of small businesses.

Ex-Im Bank aggressively reaches out to small businesses through a variety of partnerships with lenders, city and state trade offices, small business associations, Congressional offices, and other federal agencies such as the Small Business Administration. I commend Ex-Im for this effort.

Exports are crucial to the U.S. economy. Overseas sales are no longer optional for most U.S. companies. Exports accounted for over one-quarter of U.S. economic growth over the last decade and support an estimated 12 million American jobs. In order to grow the U.S. economy and increase the number of jobs, export opportunities need to grow as well. The Export-Import Bank has a critical role to play in this effort.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Export-Import Bank and supporting this conference report.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the conference report on S. 1372, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act.

The purpose of the Export-Import Bank is to create American jobs for American workers. Unfortunately, the Bank has a history of providing assistance to companies that have been exporting American jobs and hiring cheap, foreign labor. For example, the Export-Import Bank insured a $3 million loan to help General Electric build a factory where Mexican workers will make parts for appliances that will be exported back to the United States. As a result, 1,500 American workers will lose their jobs to Mexican workers who will be paid only two dollars per hour.

When the House of Representatives considered its version of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act, an amendment was offered to ensure that the Bank does not subsidize companies that are exporting American jobs instead of American-made products. Unfortunately, this amendment was not adopted.

I am especially concerned by the fact that the Conference Committee deleted the Office on Africa provision from the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act. The House version of this legislation included a requirement that the Export-Import Bank establish an Office on Africa to monitor Export-Import Bank lending for projects in African countries. This provision was supported by both the Financial Services Committee and the full House of Representatives, and there was no reason for the Conference Committee to delete it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose S. 1372, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 344, nays 78, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—344

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stenholm
Stump
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—78

Akin
Andrews
Armey
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Bartlett
Bass
Bilirakis
Bonior
Brown (OH)
Burton
Chabot
Coble
Condit
Conyers
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
DeMint
Doolittle
Duncan
Everett
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Goode
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Jackson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kerns
Kucinich
Matheson
McInnis
McKinney
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Nadler
Norwood
Oberstar
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Paul
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sanders
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Smith (MI)
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Tancredo
Wamp
Waters

NOT VOTING—12

Bachus
Bentsen
Blagojevich
Ganske
Gilchrest
Hilliard
Miller, Dan
Peterson (PA)
Riley
Roukema
Slaughter
Traficant

□ 1313

Messrs. KERNS, BARTLETT of Maryland, CRANE, HEFLEY, SULLIVAN and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. GEKAS and Mr. HERGER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTING IN AMERICA'S FUTURE ACT OF 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 432 and ask for its immediate consideration.

□ 1315

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 432

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4664) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 432 is a fair, open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4664, the Investing of America's Future Act. The purpose of this legislation is to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003, 2004 and 2005 for the National Science Foundation.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

Additionally, the rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and provides that the bill shall be considered for amendment by section. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has the authority to accord priority in recognition of Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

As an independent Federal agency, the National Science Foundation's mission is to support science and engineering among all disciplines. Currently, the NSF funds research and education activities at more than 2,000 universities, colleges, schools, businesses and other research institutions throughout the United States.

Federal investment in educating America's youth in the foundation areas of math, science and technology is the only way to maintain our competitive edge in a global economy and to create economic prosperity here at home. The ever changing world of science demands that the research behind it keep pace with the times.

This legislation will provide a 15 percent annual increase for NSF through fiscal year 2005, providing critical financial support that will ensure our Nation's continued advancement in science, education and research. Much like this Republican-led Congress has kept its commitment to double funding for the National Institutes of Health, this legislation will initiate a plan to double NSF moneys over a 5-year period.

This kind of increase is consistent with President Bush's focus on education improvements, such as the Math and Science Partnership Act and the Undergraduate Math and Science Education Improvement Act. This increase will also supply dollars for the countless major research equipment projects that have been approved but simply await funding.

Technology, science and research are powerful components in our development of society. Continually advancing science and research will discover new cures for diseases, improve our quality of life and create jobs and economic growth across America. As someone who hails from a State and region that has fully embraced the value and potential this type of scientific research offers, I can attest to how important this investment is to our future.

NSF-funded projects often bring national and even international attention to towns and cities across America, and sustained research efforts and collaborations have meant growth and new employment opportunities in those areas. This ripple effect energizes communities and attracts young Americans to fields and job markets like science and engineering, areas that are key to making American industry more competitive across the globe.

The long-time president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, physicist Karl Taylor Compton, once said, ''Modern science has developed to give mankind a way of securing a more abundant life.'' Through this important investment in science, technology and research, this Congress can help ensure for the American people and communities across our Nation a more abundant life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this fair and open rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and open rule for a noncontroversial bill. H.R. 4664, Investing in America's Future Act, will reauthorize the National Science Foundation, including an increase in funding for the NSF by 15 percent for each of the next three fiscal years. This increase will result in the doubling of the NSF budget over the next 5 years.

NSF is a critical institution whose mission is to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity and welfare; and to secure the national defense.

In doing so, NSF has worked with and funded research institutions all across the country. For example, NSF has granted over $311 million to Massachusetts last year, including $3.3 million to the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and $1.9 million to the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth to fund very, very important projects that are vital to our national security and our national defense.

This reauthorization bill was unanimously referred to the House by the Committee on Science. The funding level called for in this legislation is above the President's request, and it addresses the growing imbalance between Federal support of biomedical research and physical sciences research. It also helps to ensure that America's present and future scientists and engineers are globally competitive.

The 21st century holds a great deal of promise, but there are also serious challenges ahead. Fortunately, the United States has some of the finest researchers and research institutions in the world. We must ensure that the scientific community in this country has the resources they need to meet our challenges.

The bill before us today I think is an important step in that effort. Mr. Speaker, I commend the members of the Committee on Science for their bipartisan work on this important bill. I ask Members to support this open rule and to support the Investing in America's Future Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the sponsor of this important legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, this legislation is

named the Investing in America's Future Act because that is really what it is. Basic research is what is needed to develop new ideas for products that the world demands. It is how we develop ways to increase the efficiency and productivity in the way we produce those certain products. Basic research, which NSF has done such a tremendous job in its peer review, is really key to not only our economic security but our national security. Smart weapon technology come from basic research.

Let me for just a moment quote a previous statement from NIH, the National Institutes of Health. They said if you do not do more research, basic research coming from NSF, we are going to have to set up our own division for basic research in NIH. Adequate basic research is key to our health, key to our economy, key to our national security.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

In preparation for the discussion of the bill itself, I would just like to offer some general comments about the nature of basic research and the importance of funding basic research because that often raises questions in the mind of the public and, consequently, questions in the minds of the Congress.

Basic research is that research which is done to understand the basic underpinnings of science, the basic underpinnings of the nature of our universe and how it operates. It is very broadly based. It is not specifically directed toward any particular problem in society and sometimes not even toward a problem in the sciences. It is an effort to really learn more about the universe and how it and all its composite parts work.

That makes it very difficult to defend in the political process, but let me simply point out to my colleagues some of the results of basic research that we take for granted today.

In the 1930s, there was some research done on a very esoteric topic called stimulated coherent emission of radiation. This was theoretical work. It was very low cost work. The National Science Foundation did not exist. It was done by a professor and a few others working together, and they deduced that it was possible to have stimulated emission of light where one would have one photon, one particle of light, hitting an atom in an excited state, and one would have another photon come out that was exactly like the one that came in, and yet the one that came in would be unaffected. So one obtains double the amount of light and the light was coherent; that is, the wavelengths matched and the light was in phase.

This was essentially an unremarkable result in 1930 because no one had yet imagined a way in which it could be done, but after World War II, during which we learned a lot about more advanced physics, and researchers began investigating this with microwave radiation and discovered, in fact, it did work; this work was done by Charles Townes, a good friend of mine, a good physicist, who is now at Berkeley. He discovered that he could direct a microwave photon at an excited atom and get two microwave photons out that were coherent, traveling in exactly the same direction, in phase, and with identical frequencies.

He immediately recognized that this could also lead to light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation, and so the laser was developed about 1960, or in that time frame. It was a laboratory curiosity.

I remember the first time I saw a laser and played with it. It was almost a toy, and we had fun with it. What an amazing thing, that one could amplify light! And yet everyone today is familiar with lasers; They have become ubiquitous. We use them for everything from lining up sewers to making certain that the tiles in the ceiling of a building are level, to conducting surgery of various types, on to many other uses, cutting metals and cutting cloth. Most likely the dresses and suits that are being worn here today were cut by laser initially before they were sewn together. All of this is based on the initial research work done in 1930.

Let me take another example, nuclear magnetic resonance, an esoteric bit of research which occurred while I was in graduate school. Who really cared about the nuclear spins and magnetic moments of hydrogen nuclei? Yet that nuclear magnetic resonance work which forms the basis for what we today call magnetic resonance imaging, a fantastic medical advance. diagnostic tool, the MRI, which look inside our bodies and tell us whether we have cancer, or a torn muscle, or something else. Similarly, the CT scan came out of research in high-energy elementary particle physics, an esoteric topic as far removed from everyday life as we can imagine.

□ 1330

The question is, so what? The point is simply that during the past decade the marvelous economic expansion we enjoyed was, according to Alan Greenspan and other experts, almost entirely based on the basic research that we funded some 30 to 50 years ago. If we want to continue to enjoy economic growth and expansion, if we want to continue to lead the world, we have to also continue leading the world in basic research.

That is what this bill is all about, continuing to lead the world in basic research so that our children and grandchildren are going to have the same economic advantages that we enjoy today, just as our parents and our grandparents invested in basic research so that we could enjoy the fruits of that today. That is what this bill is about.

That is why the Congress must pass this bill so that we adequately fund basic research and continue the economic base and growth that we enjoy today, and so that we can continue to expand our basic understanding of the universe and all it contains, and learn about the scientific processes that constantly occur.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. And this is the first time I have had him yield to me in his capacity as a member of the Committee on Rules. We are all very proud of that accomplishment for him and thank him for his great leadership there and on this bill, which is a very important one.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the legislation, and I commend the Committee on Science for their excellent work on this reauthorization for the National Science Foundation funding. For a long time, our colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), has sponsored a bill and given us all the opportunity to register our support for drastically increasing the funding of the National Science Foundation. I am so pleased now that the Committee on Science has taken up that leadership, and the considerable leadership of the chairman, et cetera, of the committee to make this a possibility; that we would be on a path to doubling the National Science Foundation budget.

Mr. Speaker, I serve as a member of the House Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations. A number of years ago, we set off on this path to double the funding for the National Institutes of Health. We are in our last year of that doubling effort. It was very important to the health of the American people. So, too, is the doubling of the National Science Foundation. Not only do we have to do this, but we should do more.

We had the Tech Talent Act, which encourages young people and mentors them in studying math and science so that we have the seed corn for us to have the scientists who will maintain and improve and enhance our technological base, and as well, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) said, our economic base as well.

Our progress in the National Institutes of Health, the Human Genome Project and other progress, really springs from the improved instrumentation that came from the technology side of it, the hard sciences, physical sciences side of it, the nonbiomedical science. So we all benefit across the board in terms of biomedical research, which is so important to the American people; the economic success, which is so important to our country; and also the fulfillment of the young people who have the talent and should be encouraged to study math and science and become scientists.

So I am absolutely delighted today that in this bipartisan way we can come to the floor. I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee and the subcommittee, as well as the Members on both sides of the aisle, for making this a reality for the Congress to take this vote and make it a reality for our country; and I will do everything in my power working with them to ensure that this can be translated not only into an authorization but an appropriation as well.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of the rule and as a cosponsor and strong supporter of H.R. 4664, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, or Investing in America's Future Act.

I want to commend the members of the Committee on Rules for this open rule, and the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT); and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) of the Committee on Science; as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH); and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), for expeditiously ushering this bill through that committee and to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, a distinguished committee, chaired by Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman, released a report on national security at the beginning of 2001. While it did not receive a lot of public attention at the time, the Hart-Rudman report has been revisited often since September 11. One aspect of the report with particular relevance to the bill we are considering today is its finding and recommendation on the importance of basic research. According to the Hart-Rudman report on national security, and I quote, ''The U.S. Government has seriously underfunded basic scientific research in recent years. The quality of the U.S. education system, too, has fallen well behind those of scores of other nations. The inadequacies of our systems of research and education pose a greater threat to U.S. national security over the next quarter century than any potential conventional war that we might imagine.''

The report goes on to recommend doubling the Federal Government's investment in science and technology research and development by 2010. Mr. Speaker, the bill we pass today takes an important step in the right direction.

In addition to supporting basic research at colleges and universities nationwide, the NSF works to ensure that American teachers and professors have the skills, training, and equipment to prepare future scientists and researchers. This is critical as science and technology become increasingly important to our economy, our health, our environment, and our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to say that this is a good rule. It is an open rule. It is nice to have an open rule. More importantly, this is a good bill and deserves the support of all our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Since the dawn of man, the human race has been ingrained with a fascination and need to slip beyond its boundaries and explore the unknown. From across the continents to the depths of the ocean and to the far reaches of space, that pioneer spirit continues to this day.

The National Science Foundation embraces that spirit with its record of excellence in research, education, technological advancement, and discovery. They make possible the pioneer spirit within us all.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supplying the necessary tools to the National Science Foundation so they can continue along the path of important contributions to America and to mankind. Their programs are an important demonstration of how efficient government investment can return great dividends to society. There is no better time to invest in America's future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to House Resolution 432 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4664.

□ 1339

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4664) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, with Mr. ISAKSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to bring to the floor today H.R. 4664, the Invest in America's Future Act, which was approved unanimously by the Committee on Science. This landmark bill would put the National Science Foundation on a track to double its budget over the next 5 years, while, at the same time, imposing strict new management requirements to ensure that the National Science Foundation continues to spend our money wisely.

This Congress has already demonstrated its faith in and reliance on the National Science Foundation several times in recent months, and I hope and expect that we will continue to do so today. Earlier this year, by the overwhelming margin of 400 to 12, we passed a cybersecurity bill that relied on NSF to fund the research needed to protect our Nation's computer systems and networks. At this time last year, we passed by voice vote a bill to initiate the President's math and science education partnerships, a program that NSF is now beginning to carry out; and we have passed appropriation bills that have included generous, if still insufficient, increases for the National Science Foundation.

So the 107th Congress is already on record as acknowledging the vital role played by NSF in both research and education, and we have already recognized the Foundation's need for additional funds. Today, we take the next logical step.

The scale of NSF's budget today is simply not commensurate with the breadth and importance of its mission. Congress reached that same conclusion about the National Institutes of Health, and we have followed through by doubling that research agency's budget. But health research is not the only kind of research on which our Nation depends. And, indeed, even health research itself depends on advances outside of biomedicine, the kinds of advances that produce new research tools and new understandings of chemistry and physics.

So it is time to give NSF, a much smaller agency than NIH, a budget commensurate with its mission. When we look at the new fields of science and engineering that will boost our economy in this new century, fields like nanotechnology, where do we turn to ensure that our Nation's researchers stay at the cutting edge? The National Science Foundation. When we look at the field of information technology, which facilitates every activity in today's economy, where do we turn to ensure that the U.S. remains at the cutting edge? NSF. When we consider our even more urgent need for a highly skilled technologically-literate workforce, where do we turn to ensure that our education system, from kindergarten through postgraduate work, is preparing the people we need? You

guessed it, the National Science Foundation.

We turn to the National Science Foundation to solve some of our most pressing problems. We cannot turn from NSF when we decide where to invest Federal funds. It is time to give NSF the money it needs.

But do not take my word for it. Do not even take the word of all the university and research groups that have endorsed this bill. They are the obvious beneficiaries. Instead, listen to the major industrial entities that are backing this bill, groups like the National Association of Manufacturers, the Semiconductor Industry Association, and Technet. They understand that federally funded basic research, research which industry has little incentive to fund, is needed to keep the American economy humming.

But some may still wonder, despite the support for raising NSF's budget, whether the agency can handle such a significant increase. I would argue that there is no agency better placed to handle it. NSF is a lean agency that spends little of its budget on administration. It is the only agency in the entire Federal Government that received a green light rating from the Office of Management and Budget for the quality of its operations. It is repeatedly cited as a model of how Federal agencies should be run.

But despite NSF's stellar record, this bill will not allow the agency to rest on its laurels. The bill imposes several new management requirements to ensure that Federal taxpayer dollars are wisely spent.

□ 1345

There is a new report NSF must submit to Congress explaining how it decided to allocate its funding. There is a new requirement to ensure that the public has greater access to National Science Board meetings. There is a new joint NSF–NASA advisory committee on astronomy research.

Most importantly, there is a new process to prioritize major equipment projects and to manage them more consistently. Right now, there is no way for anyone outside the foundation to understand how these large projects, like new telescopes and research stations, are selected or ranked.

Under our bill, the director and the board will have to agree on a list of projects in priority order that will be submitted to the Congress. Actual budget proposals may still have to depart from that order, but at least we will all be starting with the same information in evaluating such budget proposals.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsible bill, it is a needed bill, it is a bill that has garnered widespread support in committee and outside this Chamber, and it deserves support from all of us today. In passing this bill, we do nothing more, and nothing less, than reaffirm some basic principles: That being the world leader in research is important to our Nation's health, defense, and economic well-being; that improving science and math education is critically important; that a great Nation should not skimp on its investments to improve human understanding of natural phenomena.

It is through NSF that we turn those principles into actions. To paraphrase Daniel Webster, it is a small agency, but there are those of us who love it. I urge support for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Investing in America's Future Act of 2002, H.R. 4664, a 3-year reauthorization bill for the National Science Foundation.

The bill represents a bipartisan effort by the Committee on Science to provide the level of resources necessary to sustain the important work of the National Science Foundation in science and engineering research and education.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the ranking Democratic member, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for their efforts to craft this bill. I also thank the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for his leadership in working closely with this side of the aisle in developing the bill.

NSF is our premier agency for support of basic research at academic institutions in the physical sciences and the nonmedical biological sciences, in mathematics, and in engineering. Basic research discoveries launch new industries that bring returns to the economy far exceeding the original public investment.

The Internet, which emerged from the research projects funding by DOD and NSF, strikingly illustrates the payoff potential of such research expenditures. In fact, over the past 50 years, half of U.S. economic productivity can be attributed to the technological innovation and the science that has supported it.

Unfortunately, the simple truth is that during the 1990s we underinvested in the fields that NSF supports.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences provides specific examples that make this case. The report shows that between 1993 and 1999 Federal research support at academic institutions fell by 14 percent in mathematics, by 7 percent in physics, by 2 percent in chemistry, and by 12 percent in electrical engineering.

Inadequate funding for basic research in such important fields imposes a price on society, because new ideas are lost that would otherwise underpin future technological advances.

Of even more importance, anemic funding of academic science and engineering research reduces the numbers of new young scientists and engineers who constitute the essential element necessary to ensure the Nation's future economic strength and security.

H.R. 4664 authorizes funding growth for NSF of 15 percent per year for 3 years, bringing the total authorization level to $7.3 billion by the third year. This follows a funding path to double NSF's budget over 5 years, as was proposed by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) in the NSF authorization bill she introduced, and I cosponsored, last year.

We were not alone in calling for substantial funding increases. Such prominent figures as Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan, former House Speaker Gingrich, and former presidential science advisor Allan Bromley have pointed out the importance of increasing support for basic research in science and engineering.

The coalition for National Science Funding, a group of 80 scientific, engineering, and professional societies, universities, and corporations, specifically called for providing a 15 percent funding increase for the NSF this year as the next step in doubling the NSF budget.

The funding growth proposed by H.R. 4664 will enable the foundation to expand its investment in cutting-edge research initiatives and shore up its core research programs.

Equally important, the bill will increase efforts to improve the skills of K–12 science and math teachers, develop better science and math curricular materials, and attract more women and minorities to careers in science and engineering.

H.R. 4664 is an important bill that will help ensure the Nation maintains a vigorous basic research enterprise, which is an essential component for a strong economy for our national security.

Mr. Chairman, I commend this measure to my colleagues and ask for their support and its passage in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) to control the time for the remainder of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation to increase the National Science Foundation budget by 15 percent for next year. This bill will put us on the path to double the NSF budget over the next 5 years.

Science inspires us to conquer the unknown, invent what does not exist, and improve what already exists. It all begins with research.

President Bush's budget proposal recognized the importance of science funding with a 9 percent increase in science and technology spending. That is the

good news. But among the various science agencies, the increases in amounts varied greatly.

The National Institutes of Health, NIH, received the lion's share of funding under the administration's proposal. The NIH budget has increased to a point where it is now larger than the rest of the budgets of the science agencies put together, and the proposed increase alone in NIH funding is larger than the research budget of the National Science Foundation.

Biomedical research is important and the NIH should receive adequate funding. The administration's proposed budget rightly recognized the importance of our physical health. But, Mr. Chairman, our citizens' economic health is just as important as their physical health.

The NSF funds the cutting edge research that allows the U.S. to dominate the high technology field. Our commitment to the funding in the bill ensures that our technological preeminence will continue. Scientific research at the NSF has greatly enhanced our lives and has advanced science and technology. Consider the benefits of better weather forecasting, the saved lives that result from MRIs, the promise of faster semiconductors, and breakthroughs in nanotechnology that will drive our scientific efforts in the new century.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4664 improves the quality of math and science education with $200 million in funding for the Math and Science Partnerships Initiative, which encourages more students to enter graduate level science studies.

In our technology-driven economy, math and science skills are essential. If we want to prepare the next generation with the skills they need for success, we must increase their knowledge of science. Either we continue to invest in the sciences, or risk losing the ability to lead the world in research. This legislation recognizes the priority of research and development, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for allowing me to share this time, and for their leadership and imagination in bringing H.R. 4664, the Investing in America's Future Act of 2002 before us today for our consideration.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important piece of legislation. I have long been a passionate advocate for the National Science Foundation and the work they oversee. This work begins the laudable goal of doubling NSF's budget over the next 5 years.

Competition for NSF grant funding is very intense. Every year NSF receives about 30,000 proposals for research in education projects. Of these, about one-third only are funded. These grants usually go to colleges, universities, academic consortia, nonprofit institutions, and small businesses. The NSF also supports collaborative projects between universities and industry, as well as U.S. participation in international cooperative research and education efforts.

By increasing the amount of money available for grants, the NSF will be able to greatly enhance opportunities for scientific inquiry, and will generate invaluable progress in a wide range of fields. The resulting discoveries will help drive economic growth and enhance the quality of life for all Americans.

NSF is the second largest source of federal funds for academic research. Students of mathematics, science, the environment and engineering will be better able to compete in the global marketplace because the investments made by NSF will generate exciting opportunities to enhance their studies.

I believe our Nation is well served by increasing the resources available for NSF. For these and many other reasons, I am proud to support this bill and I know this measure will pass the House today with overwhelming bipartisan support. This day will mark a day when we make the future of this country immeasurably brighter and bigger because investing in science is always a good investment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the angel of NIST.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the guardian of the Committee on Science for yielding the time to me.

It is with great pleasure that I rise as a very proud cosponsor to speak on behalf of H.R. 4664, the National Science Foundation Reauthorization Act. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the ranking members for their leadership on this issue. This committee has had a congenial disposition; but the bipartisan nature under which we have operated to produce this bill is a true tribute to the leadership and consensus-building skills on both sides of the aisle. I hope we can continue to work together to produce this kind of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago we made a historic pledge to double the budget of the National Institutes of Health. It took a lot of hard work to get the initial commitment, and even more to see it through. Despite a war on terrorism and an economic downturn, Congress and the administration kept its word and fulfilled that promise. The NIH is funding twice the work it did a mere 5 years ago. That is a tremendous accomplishment. In the 21st century, revolutions in our understanding of biology will rival those of physics in the 20th, and work sponsored by the NIH must continue to be a priority.

However, their initiatives cannot and must not be pursued exclusively. Science has become intricately interconnected; discoveries in one drive innovations in others. Without adequate research into the underlying fields of physics and chemistry, advancements in biology and medicine will stall. If we expect the myriad achievements of recent years to continue, we must support the underpinning science and engineering more robustly. As such, I believe we need a more balanced portfolio and need to champion the traditional areas of research, as well as the exciting new projects that have generated so many headlines of late.

□ 1400

In addition, we must do a better job of training the next generation of scientists and engineers. Fewer and fewer Americans are undertaking technical careers, accepting the torch from elder scientists and building on the accomplishments of generations past. We have made up for this shortfall largely by relying on foreign students and post-docs to fill the ever widening void. This is a poor long-term solution, and we must find ways to arrest the decline of American scientists.

The National Science Foundation is uniquely positioned to accomplish both of these goals. As the premier supporter of the overall scientific enterprise, the NSF has the exclusive ability to balance research and education dollars. They already reach across the entire scientific spectrum, touching all of the major disciplines, and can ensure underfunded areas of science and technology receive adequate support.

They are also the primary Federal agency when it comes to science education. They more than anyone else are responsible for supporting new scientists in all of the physical disciplines, and they are prepared to target traditionally underrepresented groups to fill the gaps.

I myself had the opportunity to work with NSF on the Congressional Commission on the Advancement of Women, Minorities and Persons with Disability in terms of recognizing the important contribution that they can make to the development of our next generation of scientists and engineers. As our society becomes more and more technologically focused, we must ensure that our educational system is training our youth to meet the rigorous demands of the future. The NSF has a vital role to play. I know that they are up to the task.

What is more, the NSF has consistently scored at the top of all government agencies when it comes to efficient and effective use of resources. The GAO routinely gives them favorable evaluations. They are one of only a few agencies to successfully comply with GPRA requirements. They have all the tools, and they know how to use

them. All they need are the resources. With this bill, they will have them.

I have been a consistent advocate of an increased science portfolio. This is the way to go. The NSF deserves our support. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the NSF reauthorization. H.R. 4664 is a good bill, it is a bipartisan bill; and I want to compliment Chairman BOEHLERT, Chairman SMITH, and the ranking members for closely working together so that both sides are well represented in this legislation. Even during these tight budget times, investing in basic research like that at NSF is a wise and fiscally-prudent decision. I strongly believe we must make significant long-term investments in this Nation's sciences. This bill does just that.

The need for increased funding at NSF is clear. Recent data published by the National Academy of Sciences on Federal funding for basic research shows us that we are not meeting today's challenges. Sadly, there is strong evidence of declining basic research funding in many of the physical science areas. However, since NSF is the source of 36 percent of the Federal funding for basic research that is performed at universities and colleges in the physical sciences, we now have a chance to reverse course.

In my home State of California, NSF partners with the University of California on numerous research proposals in the physical sciences. I know that this bill will continue to support those needed partnerships for our long-term science and research needs. It is clear that in this instance, the returns to the Federal Government far exceed our public investment. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this bill to increase the NSF budget.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would like to add to the comments I made a moment ago under the discussion for the rule but apply those comments specifically to the National Science Foundation.

Over the past decade, we have had some interesting trends in the funding of scientific research in the United States. However, we have failed to keep pace with that of other nations. At the moment, we are spending less on research compared to GDP in the United States than Japan does and the gap is increasing, not decreasing. Even worse, we are spending less compared to our GDP than Germany does. Even worse, we are rapidly being overtaken by South Korea. We are losing ground. Yet we are supposed to be the superpower, the world's leader, not only in military might but also in research and advancement. We have to change that trend. We made a good step in that direction a few years ago when we doubled the NIH budget over a period of 5 years. It is high time we do precisely the same for the National Science Foundation.

Just to illustrate the impact of what has happened and how things have gotten out of balance, I have here a very small chart, which I hope my colleagues can read, and at least see the trend lines, which shows very clearly what has happened to NIH, as shown on the top line. A few years ago NIH was bundled fairly closely to NASA and Department of Energy research. We decided to double it, and it has shot up exponentially as happens when you double things, whereas NASA is holding its own or slightly down, and DOE, the Department of Energy, has gone down.

We are spending less on research in the Department of Energy now than we did 10 years ago, in real dollars. The National Science Foundation, our most important basic research entity, is struggling along at the bottom of the chart. It had slight increases over the past decade, but very slight. I maintain that that is out of balance. As the rate of NIH goes up, NSF should also go up, because the National Institutes of Health builds its research on the basic research that is done under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. They go to the well of this basic research periodically and build on what has been developed there. But if they go to the well and the well is empty, all the money that we have spent for NIH is not going to count for much. It is essential that we proceed with the doubling that is proposed in this bill for the National Science Foundation. I commend Chairman BOEHLERT and Chairman SMITH for leading the charge in this effort. It is something that we must do and that we can do.

To those who are worried about budget busting, let me simply point out that this year's increase in the National Institutes of Health is greater than doubling the NSF budget will be. In other words, this year's increase in NIH is greater than the total current budget of the National Science Foundation. At the very least, we can easily afford to double the NSF budget; and by doing that over 5 years, we are spending one-fifth of what we have been spending each year to increase NIH.

This is a good bill. I urge that my colleagues vote for it. I urge that we pass this bill and put this doubling program into effect.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

(Mr. ETHERIDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and Chairman BOEHLERT and Ranking Member HALL and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for their efforts in getting this bill. I am proud to be a cosponsor as well.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 4664, Investing in America's Future Act. This legislation, that will increase the funding for the National Science Foundation, is critical and it is probably more critical at this time than anyone can imagine. I believe that maintaining our Nation's global scientific and economic leadership provides the best justification for funding basic research, and that is really what we are talking about here. I also believe that a solid academic foundation in math and science education is critical to our success as a Nation in the 21st century.

As the lead source of Federal funding for basic research at colleges and universities, NSF supports research and educational programs that are crucial to technological advances in the private sector and for training our next generation of scientists and engineers. NSF funds cutting-edge research in science and technology that is critical in the United States. The research funded by the foundation has played a pivotal role in raising the standards of living in the United States as well as around the world.

As we have already heard from others, with a very small portion of Federal spending, the National Science Foundation has had a powerful impact on national science and engineering. Every dollar invested in this agency returns manifold in its worth in economic growth. For example, over 25 percent of the Federal support for academic institutions for basic research is provided through the National Science Foundation and almost 50 percent of the funding for nonmedical research at universities is provided through the National Science Foundation. NSF also provides 46 percent of the basic research in engineering performed at colleges and universities and also helps train more than 25,000 graduate students each year. I am pleased with the accomplishments that NSF has made in research and education initiatives, and I strongly support the doubling of NSF's budget by the proposed increase of 15 percent over the next 3 years in pursuit of this effort.

As the former superintendent of schools of my home State of North Carolina, I have worked for many years to improve science and mathematics education in our schools. We need better science and mathematics education in the K–12 classrooms if we are going to have it in university students. Quality instruction is the key to helping students learn in these critical fields. At a time when we are trying to improve the quality and quantity of science and mathematics in America, appropriate investments in NSF is critical to enabling our students to compete in today's knowledge-based economy. This increase in NSF budget will

help ensure that improving science and mathematics education remains a national priority. I urge the vote and signature by the President.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI).

(Mr. GRUCCI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 4664, the Investing in America's Future Act. This bill would reauthorize the National Science Foundation at its highest level for the next 5 years, placing it in an unprecedented doubling track. I thank Chairman SMITH and Chairman BOEHLERT for the time on the floor today to speak on this very important issue and for their leadership on this increasingly important issue.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation. H.R. 4664 not only takes a decisive step to doubling the funding for the National Science Foundation but also is a clear example of the support of this House in scientific discovery and growth. Now more than ever science and technology are leading the way to not only expand America and make it the best it can be but also to protect our citizens and improve our homeland security. Technologies such as radiation detectors and highest-level x-ray are keeping our homes, our businesses, and our transportation systems safe every day. But these critical technologies originate from the same place, from the Federal laboratories and university research that benefit from the National Science Foundation. Basic research is key to generating these ground-breaking and important technologies that we utilize in our lives every day.

My district is the home to leaders in basic research, the Brookhaven National Laboratory and the State University of New York at Stony Brook. These great institutions have benefited greatly from the support and funding from the National Science Foundation, advancing their endeavors and educational opportunities for students and scientists alike.

□ 1415

I am pleased that the bill includes important language clarifying the selection process of the Major Research Equipment Account. These large scale research projects are some of the best science our Nation has to offer, and it is imperative that a clear selective process is in place with congressional oversight. I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for his leadership on this issue and for including this language in the bill.

The National Science Foundation represents the best in math and science education. In order for our Nation to remain a world leader in discovery and innovation, we must strive to educate our younger generation, engaging them in math and science activities.

It is no surprise that the bill is entitled the Investing in America's Future Act, because that is exactly what we will succeed in doing by passing this legislation. Educational programs funded by the National Science Foundation offer students opportunities for exciting studies in innovative fields of learning. From as early as grade school through to the post-doctoral level, the National Science Foundation provides the much-needed support to those students striving to achieve in the science field.

Again, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this very important legislation and thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for the time to speak here today. I look forward to the passage of this exciting bill and urge a ''yes'' vote from my colleagues.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4664, to authorize funds for the National Science Foundation. As a proud cosponsor of this legislation, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) and the ranking members for their excellent work on this; but I also want to reinforce my strong support for the $50 million funding for the Advanced Technological Education Program in FY 2002 and $55 million for the program in 2003.

The Advanced Technological Education Program is an NSF program designed to help community colleges train high-tech workers. It is the only NSF program focused solely on community colleges. This program provides funds for both existing and new ATE programs.

These programs will become increasingly important as our economy becomes more dependent on technologically skilled workers. In fact, every single one of the top 10 fastest-growing occupations identified by the Department of Labor will require specialized knowledge in the fields of math and science. ATE programs will fund technology, math and science programs that will directly contribute to student success in those fields.

A few weeks ago my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and I introduced H.R. 4680, the Science Undergraduate Community College Education Enhancement Act, or, as we call it, SUCCEED. This bill will further direct ATE money to important science, math and technology two-year education programs.

Almost half of all college students in America are enrolled in community colleges, but many of the core math and science programs at these institutions are now severely underfunded. This is unacceptable, especially at a time when our knowledge-based economy depends on a workforce with a solid grounding in math and science.

The SUCCEED Act will function in several areas. First of all, it will expand the scope of existing grant programs to not only focus on the advanced upper division courses, but on the basics in math and technology skills and science skills that are necessary for success in more advanced course work.

In addition and importantly, it will expand partnerships between 2-year and 4-year institutions. Increasingly, our 2-year community colleges are partnering with 4-year institutions, and the SUCCEED Act will provide funding for integrated research between community and 4-year colleges.

This bill will also provide access to state-of-the-art equipment for our classrooms. We cannot expect our students in the community colleges to learn the kind of advanced skills they need if we do not have the fundamental infrastructure and equipment for them to learn those skills.

Finally, this bill will establish an external advisory committee to study how the effectiveness of this legislation is proceeding and to disseminate critical information to share that with other 2-year institutions.

Again, I want to thank the staff of the Committee on Science for their outstanding work, and my own staff member, Ms. Kate Sinner, for her work on this. Thanks again to the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank everyone involved with this, but none more than the gentleman I am about to introduce to consume the balance of our time. The gentleman from Michigan (Chairman SMITH) is the spark plug behind this legislation. He is serving with great distinction on that very important Subcommittee on Research, and he constantly reminds us every single day about the importance of the work we are about.

Before yielding the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman SMITH), I would like to note that we have a staff that is second to none on the Committee on Science, Republicans and Democrats, all professionals working well together to fashion the type of product that we can bring to the floor with a great deal of pride. This is one such product, and the man most responsible for it is the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) be allowed to control the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for those gracious remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I feel privileged to be allowed to be the sponsor of this legislation, H.R. 4664. But, as we all know, we have a fantastic scientific community out there, and NSF is one of the lead agencies that has done such a tremendous job. In our committee, it has been a bipartisan support, right from the get-go, with the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research.

The last time this agency was authorized was in 1998 as part of a 3-year bill that expired at the end of fiscal year 2000. That is why I think it is so important that we move ahead with this legislation today, to make sure that the House has the kind of oversight of all agencies of government, as it is destined to do.

Let me just say that it is so clear from every evaluation and every economic analysis that the Federal investment in science and technology is about as good an investment as you can possibly make with the Americans' taxpayer money to make sure that we have the basic research for national security. Smart bombs and smart weapons and the technological ability of our economic security come from this kind of basic research.

It is also important for our economy, and we have been credited by Mr. Greenspan and many others that our economic strength is derived from the basic research that we have worked on over the last 50 years, and certainly not the least is the strength of the health in the United States.

I would like to give one quote that is very interesting, and that is from Harold Varmus, the former director of NIH. He said, ''Congress is not addressing with significant vigor the compelling needs for adequately funding the National Science Foundation, which is the basis of a lot of the research and a lot of the tools they are using at NIH.''

This bill is the product of 2 years of hearings and examinations of NSF activities by the Committee on Science and our Subcommittee on Research; and during this time the committee received input from prominent scientists, economists, government officials and from other experts with an interest in improving federally funded basic research.

In the end, we arrived at three principal conclusions. One, NSF is a model government agency with an exemplary record of supporting basic research within a peer-reviewed, competitive grant process that funds only the best cutting-edge research, and does so using under 5 percent of the total budget in overhead costs.

Second, as a relatively small Federal agency responsible for just 4 percent of the total Federal research development expenditures, NSF-funded research has led to a myriad of discoveries that have improved, as I mentioned, public health, strengthened our economy, and enhanced our lives and well-being in many ways we could not have imagined 30 years ago.

Three, a number of areas within NSF programs require additional funding to assure continued advancements in the Nation's scientific enterprise. Among them are funding new education initiatives, alleviating grant pressure within a system that cannot fund over 30 percent of highly rated research proposals.

Again, of all of these highly rated research proposals, we only end up being able to fund 30 percent of the excellent ideas that are coming in from all of the universities and research facilities. It is for these reasons that the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), I and every member of the Committee on Science called for significant increases in support for NSF in this legislation.

I say this as a true fiscal conservative that strongly supports the President's efforts to keep nondefense discretionary spending in check so we can fully focus our budget on the Federal Government's number one priority of defending our Nation, and basic research is part of that responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill today. Let me say this about research and what we do in the United States, and I think it needs to be said. Research is a very important part of what we do here in the United States, and it is a very important part of our economic growth.

About half of the economic growth in the United States today is as a result of research which has been funded in the past. We represent about 4 percent of the world's population, but we represent about 44 percent of the money that is spent on basic research. That is important, and there is a correlation.

I was fortunate to go and visit some of our national labs. They truly are national treasures. What they do through the National Science Foundation, not only through our labs but our universities around the country, makes a big, big difference.

A few years ago I was privileged to meet with a fellow by the name of Gene Fry. Now, Gene Fry is a researcher at a little company called 3M. Now, this probably was not original, but he said something very important that day. He said if we knew what we were doing, it would not be research.

There is a lot of truth to that. A lot of the projects that we fund at the beginning it is hard to defend. But ultimately the reason that we live in the world we live in today is because brave legislatures in the past and brave business people in the past have been willing to invest in projects that may not have made a lot of sense at the time.

I think we have to have the courage to stand up and say research is a very important responsibility to the Federal Government. We get a huge rate of return on the money that we invest in research, and we will determine today what kind of a world our children will live in. This is an important bill. I am happy to rise in support of it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4664, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT); the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL); and the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman SMITH) for working with me and the rest of the committee in a bipartisan manner on this important piece of legislation that makes a strong statement about our commitment to invest in America's future.

H.R. 4664 places the National Science Foundation on the path to double its budget in 5 years, which was the goal of H.R. 1472, the NSF authorization bill that I introduced last April 2001. I introduced H.R. 1472 because I strongly believed that investing in basic research, math and engineering research is essential to the future economic prosperity and global competitiveness of our country. Even after September 11, what we are depending on most now will be the kinds of technology that the research from the National Science Foundation has brought to the forefront.

The National Science Foundation plays a leading role in educating our youth in math and sciences and training the scientists and engineers of tomorrow, and the agency is working to ensure that tomorrow's high-tech workers reflect a diversity of America. It is my sincere hope that my colleagues will recognize the importance of basic research to our Nation's future and will pass H.R. 4664.

The National Science Foundation expends only 3.8 percent of the Federal research and development funds, yet this relatively small amount belies the importance of the agency to our country. The National Science Foundation provides 23 percent of the basic research funding at academic institutions. For specific research areas, the National Science Foundation's role at universities is even larger. It funds 36 percent of research in the physical sciences, 49 percent of research in the environmental sciences, 50 percent of research in engineering, 72 percent of research in mathematics, and 78 percent of research in computer science. So, clearly, the National Science Foundation plays a disproportionately important role in funding some of the most basic research areas that have implications far beyond their own academic area.

□ 1430

To give an idea of the quality and importance of the NSF-funded research to our Nation, consider the fact that over 100 Nobel prizes have been awarded to scientists supported by the National Science Foundation research in the fields of physics, chemistry, physiology and medicine and economics. In nearly every field of science and engineering are examples of outstanding research supported by the National Science Foundation. This research leads to critical advances in the understanding of our world and in technology that improves our lives.

For example, the National Science Foundation support at the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois developed the first Internet browser that led to the explosive growth of the World Wide Web. The National Science Foundation-funded research in atmospheric chemistry identified the ozone depletion over the Antarctic, the ozone hole, as it has come to be known. NSF-funded research on mathematics and solid modeling led to the widespread use of computer-aided design and computer-aided manufacturing that has revolutionized industry and enhanced workplace productivity. These are but a few examples of the scientific breakthroughs that have been funded by the NSF in recent years, and this and other research supported by NSF ultimately strengthens our economy. The connection between research funding and the strength of the economy has been expounded by such diverse sources as former presidential science advisor Allen Bromley, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, and the Hart-Rudman Commission for National Security. Yet despite the importance of basic research to the future economic health and well-being of our country, NSF now must decline more than $1 billion worth of high quality research proposals each year. Why? Because NSF's budget is insufficient to meet the demands of our Nation's vibrant research sector.

Mr. Chairman, while it is true that everyone must learn to live within their budget, and NSF has, it is a shame that top-notch proposals go unfunded for lack of resources. It is essential that our Nation's premier science research agency has the resources it needs to fund advances that could lead to the next World Wide Web or deciphering the genome of a critically important crop. Our generation has benefitted enormously from the investment of our parents and grandparents made in basic research decades ago, and we owe it to our children to see that they enjoy the same pace of technological advancement that we have enjoyed. It is critical that we invest in basic research today that will lead to better life tomorrow.

These are but a few examples of the scientific breakthroughs that have been funded by NSF in recent years, and this and other research supported by the NSF ultimately strengthens our economy. The connection between research funding and the strength of the economy has been expounded by such diverse sources as former presidential science advisor Allen Bromley, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, former speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, and the Hart-Rudman Commission on National Security.

Yet despite the importance of basic research to the future economic health and well-being of our country, NSF now must decline more than 1 billion dollar's worth of high quality research proposals each year. Why? Because NSF's budget is insufficient to meet the demands of our Nation's vibrant research sector. Mr. Chairman, while it is true that everyone must learn to live within their budget, and NSF has, it is a shame that top-notch proposals go unfunded for lack of resources.

In addition to funding basic research at our Nation's laboratories, the National Science Foundation makes essential investments in training the scientists and engineers of tomorrow. NSF research awards and direct research fellowships help train over 24,000 graduate students each year, the future scientists and engineers essential to our high-tech economy. The bill before us today seeks to strengthen NSF's graduate research fellowships by funding more research grants and increasing the average grant size and duration.

NSF programs also help to improve science education for all students and to prepare them for citizenship in a world increasingly dominated by technology. Today we continue to have manpower shortages in many high technology fields, and many industries rely on the labor and brain power of foreign nationals. The ideal way to alleviate the shortages is by ensuring that our Nation's children of all races and both genders receive the basic grounding in science and mathematics that will prepare them to pursue careers as scientists, engineers and technologists. Now, more than ever, we need to ensure that an adequate number of Americans choose careers in the sciences and engineering. We cannot allow inadequate funding to cripple NSF's efforts in this area.

Mr. Chairman, over the past few months, there has been a great deal of debate about the appropriate level of funding for the National Science Foundation. Some have proposed essentially flat levels of funding, while others have proposed a small 8.8% increase for one fiscal year. These levels are simply not enough for an agency as highly regarded and as critical to the future well-being of our Nation as the National Science Foundation. I say that we must double the budget of NSF and invest in our Nation's future. H.R. 4664 was developed in a bipartisan fashion and enjoys the strong support of the Science Committee. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Committee on Science for its work in putting together this reauthorization for the National Science Foundation. This bill shows us the path we must take to ensure that our Nation continues to lead the world in technological innovation and in scientific capacity, by doubling Federal funding for the NSF over the next 5 years, just as we have done for the National Institutes of Health.

In a widely-circulated letter last year, Dr. Harold Varmus, the former director of the NIH, made it clear that we do health research no favors when we underfund basic research in the physical sciences. Physical science disciplines are often the key not only to providing the tools used in conducting health research, but in delivering the benefits of health research to the public.

Just take a walk through any hospital surgical unit or emergency room, where you will be surrounded by more pieces of medical technology than you can count, and you will quickly understand this point.

I also want to draw the attention of Members to the bill's reauthorization of the National Science Foundation's Advanced Technology Education program. The ATE program is the only NSF program targeted to community colleges.

Associate-degree-granting colleges educate the vast majority of the three to five technicians that support each engineer, scientist, and medical doctor across this Nation.

Meeting the demand for high-tech workers by both our modernizing manufacturing sector and our new-economy enterprises requires strengthening undergraduate education in science, mathematics, and technology at associate-degree-granting colleges, where nearly half of all undergraduate college students are enrolled. That is the purpose of the ATE program, which provides grants to 2-year institutions to develop new curricula and teaching methods and materials in advanced technology fields.

I have worked on our Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations to increase ATE funding, and we have enjoyed some successes. However, current funding is still under $40 million a year, and cut of $950,000 has been recommended by the administration for the next fiscal year. A more adequate authorization would offer considerable help.

Fortunately, the Committee on Science accepted an amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), to authorize the ATE program at $50 million for fiscal year 2003, with a $5 million increase for each of the next 2 fiscal years.

In fact, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and I have introduced legislation to more broadly expand and strengthen the ATE program.

In addition to increasing funding for the program, the Science Undergraduate Community College Education Enhancement Development Act, the SUCCESS Act, H.R. 4680, would give community colleges more flexibility to develop innovative core math

and science curricula, and would provide more opportunities for community college students to have research experiences at 4-year institutions.

Our bill would also establish an advisory committee, comprised of representatives from industry and academia, to evaluate the effectiveness of the ATE program and to make recommendations on how it can be improved. Also, it would promote the dissemination of ATE results to community college systems across the Nation.

While the increased authorization level for the ATE program is included in the bill before us now, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) was successful in adding the remaining provisions of H.R. 4680 to the Undergraduate Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Improvement Act, which was also recently approved by the Committee on Science.

I again congratulate the Committee on Science and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the fine work they have done today in bringing H.R. 4664 to the House floor. I urge all of our colleagues to support it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from California, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this legislation. It is, I think, very important, and I think the committee, under the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), has done an excellent job.

We heard that the National Science Foundation provides only a few percent of the total Federal research and development budget, but it provides a large fraction of the support for mathematics, biological sciences, earth sciences, social sciences, and engineering.

We have all heard about the many things that have come out of NSF research: the work in thin film technology, in genetics, in magnetic resonance imaging, CD players, printers, Taxol, and so forth.

It is also important to recognize the return on investment to this Federal investment. Economists will argue about whether the return on investment in research and development is 20 percent, 40 percent, or 60 percent. Whatever it is, it is extraordinarily high. This is one of the best things that we as a Congress can do who have been entrusted with the worthwhile expenditure of taxpayer money.

As one Member of Congress who himself has conducted NSF-funded research, and who every year that I have been in Congress has worked to see the NSF budget increased, I am very pleased to see the NSF on this faster growth path, because we can talk about funding the National Institutes of Health and other health-related research here in the United States, but unless we invest in the research that leads to improved techniques and instrumentation and the training of scientists, that investment in health research will not yield the returns that we should be getting from it.

Just today I have been having some briefings with investigative and intelligence organizations. They have reminded me just today how much they are dependent on research that is coming out of the National Science Foundation for their work in dealing with anthrax and other pathogens.

Finally, I would say the most important work that the National Science Foundation is doing is the work in our schools, particularly in the pre-college setting. The members of the committee are to be commended for putting together such a good authorization bill.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. I would like to commend the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Science and the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research for their leadership on this issue.

Investment in research and development is one of the single largest contributing factors to the Nation's past, present, and future economic growth. The U.S. high technology industry spends more on R&D than on any other industry, but because corporations feel acute pressure to focus scarce research dollars on market-driven product development, the Federal Government must play an integral role in the longer-term basic research that leads to fundamental innovations.

Federal support for basic research has contributed to the development of the Internet, personal computers, the silicon chip, lasers, fiber optics, supercomputers, and magnetic resonance imaging. The first graphical web browser, high-speed networks, artificial intelligence, databases, and the graphical user interface all have their roots in government-sponsored research.

Over the past few years, funding for research in the physical sciences has declined as a fraction of overall R&D spending. Funding for the National Institutes of Health now makes up over half of all non-defense research, and the proposed research at NIH funding this year is as large as NSF's entire budget.

This funding imbalance threatens long-term research at a time when we are quickly approaching the physical limits to semiconductor performance. A new technological revolution is needed if we are going to continue improving computer performance like we have in the past few years. It is essential that we invest in basic research to provide the scientific basis for this technological revolution so that we can maintain the gains in productivity that lead to economic growth.

A sustained public and private investment in R&D will also foster a skilled American work force, stimulate new technologies, and maintain U.S. dominance in vital industries, elements critical to retaining the United States' global economic leadership in the new millennium.

The 2001 report of the Hart-Rudman Commission on National Security for the 21st Century determined that ''the scale and nature of the ongoing revolution in science and technology . . . pose critical national security challenges to the United States.''

To address the challenge, the commission recommended a doubling of all Federal funding for science and technology research and development by 2010. I believe we should strive to achieve this goal, and I recommend and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4664.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that it would be nice just to include myself in the good remarks made by both sides of the aisle on the importance of basic research.

One area that we have not talked about that I think is so important in NSF is it keeps young, quality minds at that university staying in research, so it encourages the talented young people in our university systems to stay on, to get their Master's degrees and their Doctor's degree.

Just in terms of sort of proving that point, if we are looking at all the Nobel Laureates in physics, in chemistry, and in economics, most every one of those individuals at one time in their career had an NSF grant. So part of the tremendous success of the program is keeping these talented young people in that research arena to do what is necessary to strengthen our economy, to improve our public health, and certainly to add to our ability to defend ourselves and our national security.

□ 1445

America's position as a world leader in science and education is a key element to our national security. Let me just mention in the report on national security in the 21st century, the Hart-Rudman Commission noted that and, I will quote, ''The inadequacies of our systems of research and education pose a greater threat to U.S. national security over the next quarter century than any potential conventional war that we might imagine.''

It is important that we move ahead, that we improve our education system, that we work more diligently than we ever have before, keeping more students in the math and sciences as they

move their careers through high school and into the college arena.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to summarize by saying that I believe we have put together a strong piece of legislation that will allow Congress to demonstrate its commitment to continuing the economic gains and technological advances of recent years through support of fundamental basic research. The increase in this legislation is a sound investment and is brought by bipartisan support, was passed through both the Subcommittee on Research and the full Committee on Science by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support the bill.

I would like to point out that NSF-funded research has also directly benefited America's effort in response to the events of 9/11—supporting emergency grants pioneering the use of genomics as a tool in forensic analysis of microbes after last October's anthrax attacks. Also, an NSF-funded robotics grant led to the development of software-guided robots that were used successfully to search the rubble and locate victims at the World Trade Center Disaster site.

NSF research has also led to faster computer Magnetic Resonance Imaging the Internet, Doppler radar, discoveries of new planets, new polymers materials that are used in products ranging from clothing to automobiles, and most recently, fundamental plant genomics research that will lead to improved crop varieties that increase yields while better protecting the environment. These are just a few examples, but the list goes on and on.

I want to reiterate that NSF has supported these achievements with an efficiency that is almost unheard of in the Federal Government. NSF has been recognized for it's strong management—as the only cabinet agency to receive a ''green light'' rating in the President's budget. Mitch Daniels, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, has hailed NSF as ''one of the true centers of excellence in government.''

Let me summarize by saying that I believe we have put together a strong piece of legislation that will allow Congress to demonstrate its commitment to continuing the economic gains and technological advancements of recent years through support of fundamental basic research. The increase in this legislation is a sound investment and has broad bipartisan support, was passed through both the Research Subcommittee and the full Science Committee by voice vote, and I urge all members to support the bill.

NSF has supported the research of more than half of the United States Nobel laureates in physics, chemistry, and economics. Since 1989, 80% of NSF-funded Nobel prize winners were funded by NSF before winning the prize.

Research supported by the National Science Foundation has led to a myriad of discoveries, technologies, and products that improve our daily lives, including: a greater understanding of bacteria, viruses, and the structure of DNA; medical diagnostic tools, such as Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI); the Internet, web browsers, and fiber optics, which have revolutionized global communication; automated DNA sequencing machines; polymer materials used in products ranging from clothing to automobiles; Doppler radar used for accurate weather forecasting; artificial skin that can help recovering burn victims; economic research in game and decision theory which has led to a greater understanding of economic cycles; and discoveries of new planets, black holes, and insights into the nature of the universe.

More recently, NSF-funded research has benefited America's effort in response to the events of 9/11. An NSF-funded grant led to the development of software-guided robots that were used successfully to search the rubble and locate victims at the World Trade Center disaster site. Also, NSF supported emergency grants pioneering the use of genomics as a tool in forensic analysis of microbes after last October's anthrax attacks.

These advances have all come from an agency that receives only 4% of the total annual Federal spending for R&D.

NSF has also been the lead Federal agency in a number of national science initiatives, such as those in information technology, plant genomics, and nanotechnology.

The National Science Foundation's innovative education programs work to ensure that every American student receives a solid foundation in science and math through support for the training and education of teachers, the public, and students of all ages and backgrounds, and by supporting research into new teaching tools, curricula, and methodologies.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my concern over this legislation that will double the National Science Foundation's (NSF) budget in five years. I feel that while we have taken the effort to double the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and now NSF, this committee has neglected NASA. I am supportive of our commitment to NSF and have a history of such support. At this time, however, given the lack of attention this committee has given NASA, I cannot support this particular piece of legislation.

NASA's budget has been neglected for over a decade. When one considers inflation, the NASA budget is not keeping pace. This sends the wrong message. As a medical doctor and scientist, I very much appreciate the work that NIH and NSF do, but to keep NASA out in the cold I feel is the wrong approach. No other agency has such a daring, exciting and public mission. It is time we treated NASA as a valued Federal agency instead of letting it wither on the vine.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4664, the Investing in America's Future Act. Past investment in fundamental scientific research has fueled growth of our economy, trained our technological workforce, and provided the research needed for national and homeland security. It is time to ensure our future prosperity and security by recognizing the important work performed by the National Science Foundation (NSF), the only agency devoted to supporting basic science research in science, math, and engineering across all fields and science and math education at all levels.

This legislation will double the NSF's budget over the next five years. Increasing funding for the NSF demonstrates the recognition of the lasting benefits that basic research provides to our economic and national security. The increase would also be used to expand core science programs to fund highly ranked grant proposals, pursue new initiatives like nanotechnology and biocomplexity, and fully fund K–12 education programs that have been authorized by the House of Representatives. In addition, the bill provides greater transparency to the process through which major research and facilities construction projects are evaluated, prioritized, and selected for funding by requiring the Director to develop a list of proposed projects, ranking the relative priority of each for funding. This will allow Congress and NSF to expand its investments in cutting-edge research initiatives and to preserve its core research and education programs.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly believe that investing in basic science, math, and engineering research is essential to the future economic prosperity and global competitiveness of our country and an important investment for the future. For these reasons, I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H.R. 4664, I rise in support of this important bill that will put the National Science Foundation on a track to double its budget in five years.

I thank Chairman BOEHLERT and my colleagues in the Science Committee for their hard work on this bill.

I think we all recognize that investing in basic research is critical for a strong economy and national security. In the past 50 years, half of U.S. economic productivity can be attributed to technological innovation and the science that has supported it. Despite this fact, over the last two decades Federal investment in R&D has fallen by one-third as a share of the GDP.

This bill will help put us on the right track. Federal investment in science underpins our global competitiveness and our prosperity. NSF-funded research made possible the discovery of the ''ozone hole,'' developed the first Web browser, advanced the field of molecular genetics, and funded much of the early research leading to the development of speech activation and recognition technology. Less directly but no less importantly, NSF is often the major source of support for education and training of Ph.D. scientists and engineers, many of whom have gone on to make major private-sector contributions in the development of cell phones, fiber optics, and computer assisted design.

NSF provides fully 23% of total Federal support for university research—or nearly half excluding NIH sponsored biomedical research. From sources such as former science advisor to the first President Bush, Allen Bromley, and Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, to the Hart-Rudman Commission on National Security, we hear that Federal funding for research is a necessary precondition for continued economic success and security in our high technology economy.

I think former Speaker Newt Gingrich said in best in a 1999 Washington Post op-ed. He wrote that ''Out of our sense of patriotism and our own enlightened self-interest, we should . . . insist that Federal investment in scientific research be doubled over the next five years. . . . Anything less will weaken the future for all of us.''

Mr. Chairman, I agree, and I urge support of this important bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Members of the Science Committee, subcommittee, sponsor, and all the Members who worked so hard on

H.R. 4664, the Investing in America's Future Act of 2002.

I would like to take this opportunity today to voice my strong support for this legislation.

This legislation authorizes additional funding to a very important organization, the National Science Foundation.

The bills directs NASA to jointly establish an Astronomy and Astrophysics Advisory Committee to assess and provide recommendations regarding the coordination of astronomy and astrophysics programs at each agency.

This is one of the several provisions in this bill that would strengthen NASA. NASA plays a huge role in the 18th Congressional District, as many of my constituents are employed there.

The continued development of this nation's science program ought to be one of this nation's top priorities. By establishing a joint committee on astronomy to assess coordination of astronomy programs between the agencies and to assess the activities of the agencies relative to recommendations of the surveys conducted by the National Academy of Sciences, this bill would further make the science program accountable to Congress.

As a member of the Science Committee, I can attest to the fact that we have held numerous hearings investigating and asking relevant questions on how to best fund the NSF and how to best make it accessible and accountable to Congress.

By focusing directly on the research initiatives such as information technology, nanoscale science and engineering, and mathematical sciences, as well as the Major Research Instrumentation program, H.R. 4664 further enhances the research and education departments of the National Science Foundation.

Let me also voice my strong support for the funding of minority institutions in science education. This provision will open the door for many future scientists to carry the torch for many years to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, which will reauthorize the National Science Foundation for the next three years. This bill is of the highest priority to me and to many colleges and universities in my district. I've already heard from students, professors and administrators from the University of Wisconsin who have told me that a lack of serious commitment to science funding and research would not only stunt the growth and education of many qualified students, but would also seriously cripple some of their most critical research efforts. This is why I'm delighted with the commitment in this legislation to increase NSF funding by 15 percent each year for the next three years. This commitment is similar to the highly successfully funding commitment that doubled the National Institutes of Health budget over the past five years.

The NSF funds 25% of the basic research conducted in universities across the nation, and a considerably higher percentage in selected fields. The NSF funds 425 grants for well over $60 million at the University of Wisconsin-Madison alone, helping to make UW-Madison one of the top research universities in the country. NSF grants and fellowships also help train over 24,000 graduate students each year, many of whom go on to make major contributions in academia and industry. University research funded by the NSF trains new generations of scientists and engineers, but without the type of funding increase outlined in this legislation, universities will be forced to limit the number of graduate students that they are able to admit to these programs.

One example of a thriving NSF project in my district is the IceCube Neutrino telescope, which is headed by UW-Madison. When completed, this groundbreaking new telescope will look deep into our universe in ways that traditional telescopes cannot. It is truly on the cutting edge of astronomical research and will allow us to view the universe in an entirely new and innovative manner. Furthermore, IceCube has been subjected to exhaustive peer review and is one of many shining examples of the sound science and basic research that the NSF successfully fosters.

It is my sincere hope that funding levels outlined in this legislation are met when it comes time to fund the NSF. Science funding for research should be and often is a result of bipartisanship. I am pleased that this is the case today. In that spirit, I urge a yes vote on this legislation and urge appropriators to fully fund the NSF at these new levels.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of a bill designed to improve the security, economy, and standard of living of all Americans, the Investing in America's Future Act, H.R. 4664. The bill accomplishes this by putting the nation's premier science agency, the National Science Foundation, on track to double its budget in five years.

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that America has long recognized that its long-term strength and security, and its ability to recover and sustain high levels of economic growth, depends on maintaining its edge in scientific achievement and technological innovation. Biomedical advances have permitted us to live longer, healthier, and more productively. Advances in agriculture technology have permitted us to be able to feed more people at a cheaper cost. The information revolution can be seen today in the advanced instruments schools are using to instruct our children and in the vast information resources that are opened up as a result of the linkages created by a networked global society. Our children today can grow up to know, see, and read more, be more diverse, and have more options in their lives for learning and growing. Other emerging technologies—such as nanotechnology—have untold potential to make our lives more existing, secure, prosperous, and challenging.

Many companies also recognize this and they, therefore, focus their industrial, economic, and security policies on the nurturing and diffusion of technological advancement through all levels of society in a deliberate fashion. Countries that follow this path of nurturing innovation focus a lot of their efforts into recruiting and training the very best engineers and scientists, ensuring that a pipeline which pumps talented and imaginative minds and skills is connected to the needs of the country's socio-economic and security enterprise.

It always pays to be mindful of the fact—especially in the wake of the September 11 events—that there is a strong and tight linkage between our national security and the level of science and technology proficiency in America. Our strength and leadership in the world is based on the might of our defense, strength of our economy, and the quality of our education system. Without any one of these three components the global preeminence of the nation suffers. These three components are, in turn, maintained on a foundation of strong leadership in the business of scientific and technological innovation, which keeps the engines of progress moving forward.

To remain a strong nation, we must ensure that the single most important element that keeps us dynamic, innovative, prosperous, and secure—and therefore strong—is there for us: our science and technology enterprise. In short, we need to support the NSF and we need to support this bill.

I am honored to be a sponsor of this important legislation in the United States House of Representatives and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4664, the ''Investing in America's Future Act.'' This bill reauthorizes the National Science Foundation (NSF) for three years, increasing its funding by 15% each year. Today we are taking an important step forward by enhancing our commitment to our nation's science enterprise and setting a long-term goal of doubling the budget of NSF.

The National Science Foundation is the only Federal agency devoted to supporting basic research in science, math, and engineering across all fields and science and math education at all levels. In fact, NSF funds 25% of the basic research conducted in U.S. universities, and a considerably higher percentage in selected fields. NSF grants and fellowships help train over 24,000 graduate students each year, many of whom go on to make major contributions in academia and industry.

My district is home to one of our nation's premier scientific research institutions, the California Institute of Technology (Caltech), and one of the most prominent beneficiaries of NSF grant funding. In fiscal year 2001, Caltech received 31% of its total federal agency research support from NSF, totaling near $44 million. And Caltech is not alone. In fiscal year 1999, NSF provided 16% of the total federal research and development funds provided to ALL California universities, an impressive sum of $367 million.

By increasing NSF funding, we will enable this fine institution to expand core science programs, fund highly ranked grant proposals that would otherwise go unfunded, and pursue new initiatives such as nanotechnology and biocomplexity. We must continue to support the backbone of our new economy—fundamental scientific research and education—by supporting the National Science Foundation and its many groundbreaking endeavors.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4664 and to remain steadfast in our commitment to our nation's science enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed

in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Investing in America's Future Act of 2002''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 2 DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BOARD.—The term ''Board'' means the National Science Board established under section 2 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861).

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(3) FOUNDATION.—The term ''Foundation'' means the National Science Foundation.

(4) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(5) NATIONAL RESEARCH FACILITY.—The term ''national research facility'' means a research facility funded by the Foundation which is available, subject to appropriate policies allocating access, for use by all scientists and engineers affiliated with research institutions located in the United States.

(6) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'' means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2003.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation $5,515,260,000 for fiscal year 2003.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) $4,138,440,000 shall be made available to carry out Research and Related Activities, of which—

(i) $704,000,000 shall be for networking and information technology research;

(ii) $238,450,000 shall be for the Nanoscale Science and Engineering Priority Area;

(iii) $60,090,000 shall be for the Mathematical Sciences Priority Area; and

(iv) $75,900,000 shall be for Major Research Instrumentation;

(B) $1,006,250,000 shall be made available for Education and Human Resources, of which—

(i) $50,000,000 shall be for the Advanced Technological Education Program established under section 3 of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 1862i); and

(ii) $30,000,000 shall be for the Minority Serving Institutions Undergraduate Program;

(C) $152,350,000 shall be made available for Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction;

(D) $210,160,000 shall be made available for Salaries and Expenses; and

(E) $8,060,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2004.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation $6,342,550,000 for fiscal year 2004.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) $4,735,600,000 shall be made available to carry out Research and Related Activities, of which—

(i) $774,000,000 shall be for networking and information technology research;

(ii) $286,140,000 shall be for the Nanoscale Science and Engineering Priority Area;

(iii) $90,090,000 shall be for the Mathematical Sciences Priority Area; and

(iv) $85,000,000 shall be for Major Research Instrumentation;

(B) $1,157,190,000 shall be made available for Education and Human Resources, of which $55,000,000 shall be for the Advanced Technological Education Program established under section 3 of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 1862i);

(C) $225,000,000 shall be made available for Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction;

(D) $216,460,000 shall be made available for Salaries and Expenses; and

(E) $8,300,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(c) FISCAL YEAR 2005.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation $7,293,930,000 for fiscal year 2005.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) $5,445,940,000 shall be made available to carry out Research and Related Activities;

(B) $1,330,770,000 shall be made available for Education and Human Resources;

(C) $285,710,000 shall be made available for Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction;

(D) $222,960,000 shall be made available for Salaries and Expenses; and

(E) $8,550,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

SEC. 4. OBLIGATION OF MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT FUNDS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2003.—None of the funds authorized under section 3(a)(2)(C) may be obligated until 30 days after the first report required under section 7(a)(2) is transmitted to the Congress.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2004.—None of the funds authorized under section 3(b)(2)(C) may be obligated until 30 days after the report required by June 15, 2003, under section 7(a)(2) is transmitted to the Congress.

(c) FISCAL YEAR 2005.—None of the funds authorized under section 3(c)(2)(C) may be obligated until 30 days after the report required by June 15, 2004, under section 7(a)(2) is transmitted to the Congress.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL PLAN FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of legislation providing for the annual appropriation of funds for the Foundation, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, a plan for the allocation of funds authorized by this Act for the corresponding fiscal year. The portion of the plan pertaining to Research and Related Activities shall include a description of how the allocation of funding—

(1) will affect the average size and duration of research grants supported by the Foundation by field of science, mathematics, and engineering;

(2) will affect trends in research support for major fields and subfields of science, mathematics, and engineering, including for emerging multidisciplinary research areas; and

(3) is designed to achieve an appropriate balance among major fields and subfields of science, mathematics, and engineering.

SEC. 6. PROPORTIONAL REDUCTION.

(a) OVERALL AMOUNTS.—If the amount appropriated pursuant to section 3(a)(1), (b)(1), or (c)(1) is less than the amount authorized under that paragraph, the amount available under each subparagraph of paragraph (2) of that subsection shall be reduced by the same proportion.

(b) RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES AMOUNTS.—If the amount appropriated pursuant to section 3(a)(2)(A) or (b)(2)(A) is less than the amount authorized under that subparagraph, the amount available under each clause of that subparagraph shall be reduced by the same proportion.

SEC. 7. NATIONAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.

(a) PRIORITIZATION OF PROPOSED MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF PRIORITIES.—

(A) LIST.—The Director shall develop a list indicating by number the relative priority for funding under the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction account that the Director assigns to each project the Board has approved for inclusion in a future budget request. The Director shall submit the list to the Board for approval.

(B) UPDATES.—The Director shall update the list prepared under paragraph (1) each time the Board approves a new project that would receive funding under the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction account and as necessary to prepare reports under paragraph (2). The Director shall submit any updated list to the Board for approval.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than each June 15th thereafter, the Director shall transmit to the Congress a report containing—

(A) the most recent Board-approved priority list developed under paragraph (1);

(B) a description of the criteria used to develop such list; and

(C) a description of the major factors for each project that determined its ranking on the list, based on the application of the criteria described pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(3) CRITERIA.—The criteria described pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) shall include, at a minimum—

(A) scientific merit;

(B) broad societal need and probable impact;

(C) consideration of the results of formal prioritization efforts by the scientific community;

(D) readiness of plans for construction and operation;

(E) international and interagency commitments; and

(F) the order in which projects were approved by the Board for inclusion in a future budget request.

(b) FACILITIES PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(a)(1) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 1862l(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall prepare, and include as part of the Foundation's annual budget request to Congress, a plan for the proposed construction of, and repair and upgrades to, national research facilities, including full life-cycle cost information.''.

(2) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—Section 201(a)(2) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 1862l(a)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', including costs for instrumentation development'' after ''described in paragraph (1)'';

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B);

(C) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(D) for each project funded under the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction account—

''(i) estimates of the total project cost (from planning to commissioning); and

''(ii) the source of funds, including Federal funding identified by appropriations category and non-Federal funding;

''(E) estimates of the full life-cycle cost of each national research facility;

''(F) information on any plans to retire national research facilities; and

''(G) estimates of funding levels for grants supporting research that will make use of each national research facility.''.

(3) DEFINITION.—Section 2 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 1862k note) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) FULL LIFE-CYCLE COST.—The term 'full life-cycle cost' means all costs of development, procurement, construction, operations and support, and shut down costs, without regard to funding source and without regard to what entity manages the project.''.

(c) PROJECT MANAGEMENT.—No national research facility project funded under the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction account shall be managed by an individual whose appointment to the Foundation is temporary.

SEC. 8. MAJOR RESEARCH INSTRUMENTATION.

The Foundation shall conduct a review and assessment of the Major Research Instrumentation Program and provide a report to Congress on its findings and recommendations within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act. The report shall include—

(1) estimates of the needs, by major field of science and engineering, of institutions of higher education for the types of research instrumentation that are eligible for funding under the guidelines of the Major Research Instrumentation Program;

(2) the distribution of awards and funding levels by year and by major field of science and engineering for the Major Research Instrumentation Program, since the inception of the Program; and

(3) an analysis of the impact of the Major Research Instrumentation Program on the research instrumentation needs that were documented in the Foundation's 1994 survey of academic research instrumentation needs.

SEC. 9. ASTRONOMY AND ASTROPHYSICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly establish an Astronomy and Astrophysics Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ''Advisory Committee'').

(b) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall—

(1) assess, and make recommendations regarding, the coordination of astronomy and astrophysics programs of the Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) assess, and make recommendations regarding, the status of the activities of the Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as they relate to the recommendations contained in the National Research Council's 2001 report entitled ''Astronomy and Astrophysics in the New Millennium'', and the recommendations contained in subsequent National Research Council reports of a similar nature; and

(3) not later than March 15 of each year, transmit a report to the Director, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Congress on the Advisory Committee's findings and recommendations under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Committee shall consist of 13 members, none of whom shall be a Federal employee, including—

(1) 5 members selected by the Foundation;

(2) 5 members selected by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

(3) 3 members selected by the members selected under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(d) SELECTION PROCESS.—Initial selections under subsection (c)(1) and (2) shall be made within 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. Initial selections under subsection (c)(3) shall be made within 5 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as provided in subsection (c).

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Advisory Committee shall select a chairperson from among its members.

(f) COORDINATION.—The Advisory Committee shall coordinate with the advisory bodies of other Federal agencies, such as the Department of Energy, which may engage in related research activities.

(g) COMPENSATION.—The members of the Advisory Committee shall serve without compensation, but shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Committee shall convene, in person or by electronic means, at least 4 times a year.

(i) QUORUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a majority of the members serving on the Advisory Committee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of conducting the business of the Advisory Committee.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The selection of a member under subsection (c)(3) shall require a vote of ¾ of the members appointed under subsection (c)(1) and (2).

(j) DURATION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

SEC. 10. BOARD MEETINGS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that the Board complies with the requirements of section 552b of title 5, United States Code, that all meetings, with the exception of specific narrow statutory exemptions, be open to the public.

(b) COMPLIANCE AUDIT.—The Inspector General of the National Science Foundation shall conduct an annual audit of the compliance by the Board with the requirements described in subsection (a). The audit shall examine the extent to which the proposed and actual content of closed meetings is consistent with those requirements.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than February 15 of each year, the Inspector General of the National Science Foundation shall transmit to the Congress the audit required under subsection (b) along with recommendations for corrective actions that need to be taken to achieve fuller compliance with the requirements described in subsection (a), and recommendations on how to ensure public access to the Board's deliberations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. RIVERS

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. RIVERS:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 11. SCHOLARSHIP ELIGIBILITY.

The Director shall not exclude part-time students from eligibility for scholarships under the Computer Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Scholarship (CSEMS) program.

Ms. RIVERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment that will offer relief in some very complicated lives. The NSF currently administers the Computer Science, Engineering and Mathematics Scholarships program, which was established by the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act of 1998.

This program assists students training to enter the high-tech workforce in computer science, computer technology, engineering, engineering technology or mathematics. Unfortunately, NSF requires that students be enrolled full time as students, precluding working students, especially older students who have full time jobs and families, from qualifying for these scholarships. As someone who attended college and law school while juggling work and family obligations, I know firsthand how much good a change like this would do for folks who are working so hard.

The data clearly shows that traditional full-time students are no longer the overwhelming majority of those attending undergraduate institutions. The U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics found in 1999, the most recent data available, that of the 15 million students here in the United States, nearly 6 million, or 41 percent, were attending on a part-time basis. According to the current population survey conducted by the Census Bureau, the greatest percentage rise in college attendance was by women 30 and over, 2.3 million new students. Approximately 23 percent of all male college and graduate students were age 30 or older.

The National Center for Education Statistics has estimated that in 2000, students 25 or older outnumbered those younger than 25. And according to the American Association of Community Colleges, community colleges in this country enroll over 10 million students, that is 44 percent of all United States undergrads, and 63 percent of those attending community college are part-time students.

The average age of a student at a community college is now 29 years old. Furthermore, more than 80 percent of community college students balance studies with full-time or part-time work.

My amendment simply states that NSF's CSEMS program would be open to students enrolled in appropriate programs less than full time. The expansion of the CSEMS program will open the doors of opportunity to those who want to acquire or finish degrees in the very fields we need the most workers,

high technology. Add flexibility to the program and allow university administrators the discretion to help those who need the help most, regardless of whether they are an 8-, 10-, 12-, or 16-credit student per quarter. It would also enable NSF to administer all of the scholarship funds it currently has available under this program.

I understand that much of this money sits unused due to lack of advertising, which is compounded due to the exclusion of part-time students. This amendment would fix the problem.

In my home State of Michigan, several schools have received CSEMS program grants, including the University of Michigan that I represent, Grand Valley State University, Western State University, Central Michigan University, Kettering University, Lake Superior State University, and the University of Detroit. All of these institutions enroll part-time students, but none of those students are eligible for this program.

We should extend the same assistance to them as their full-time colleagues receive. Having access to the CSEMS scholarship can make a significant difference when it comes to making a choice about pursuing a degree or not. The availability of Federal help in financing my education allowed me to go from being a teen mom working in low-wage jobs to being a Member of this august body. Education made the difference.

Let us open the door to success just a little bit wider so more Americans can walk through it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is correct. More and more of our students are adult and are part-time. It is a good amendment, and we accept the amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague from Michigan's amendment. This amendment seeks to expand educational opportunities for working Americans in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

NSF's Computer Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Scholarship (CSEMS) Program was established to support financially needy post-secondary students pursuing careers in the high-tech sector. The acute shortage of trained scientists and engineers in our country is well documented, and critical sectors of our economy find it necessary to import high-tech labor from other countries under the H–1 B visa program.

NSF is doing a great deal to address the shortage of home-grown scientists and engineers, but currently, the CSEMS program is only eligible to full-time students. The expansion of the eligibility of the CSEMS program to include part-time students will have two important results. The first is that it addresses our nation's need for more scientists and engineers in key sectors of our economy. The second is that it provides talented, motivated, and economically needy students with the resources they need to improve their quality of life and fulfill their dreams.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WOOLSEY:

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(d) BIOSAFETY RESEARCH.—Of the amount authorized under subsection (a)(2)(A), $15,000,000, and of the amount authorized under subsection (b)(2)(A), $20,000,000, shall be available for support of fundamental research in areas related to assessing biosafety. For purposes of this subsection, the term ''biosafety'' means safety with respect to the effects of biological research on organisms and the environment.

Ms. WOOLSEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would create a research program within the National Science Foundation to address a significant gap of knowledge on biosafety, a gap of knowledge that must be filled. The amendment establishes the Biosafety Research Program, so we can understand in scientific terms the effects of altering biological systems. It funds the basic science needed to understand the effects of introducing new plant and animal varieties through both traditional breeding techniques and through new methods of biotechnology in our agriculture, horticulture and aquaculture systems.

For thousands of years we have experimented with plants, animals, microbes, and ecological systems in an effort to survive and prosper through the development of food and fiber sources, medicines and other materials essential to our well-being.

Essentially, we have been moving our biological system around, sometimes intentionally, sometimes not intentionally.

Here I use the term ''biological systems'' in the broadest sense. A biological system could be a set of genes, a whole organism, an ecosystem, or a group of ecosystems that co-exist in the landscape. It is no secret, Mr. Chairman, that a contentious debate has surrounded the introduction of biotechnology products. The debate has been characterized more by statements of hope by the advocates and fear from opponents than by science-based information. It is time we replace the rhetoric, the rhetoric on both sides, with a firm understanding of how these varieties are likely to operate in the real world.

With the adoption of my amendment, the Biosafety Research Program will provide an identifiable pool of research funds for scientists to ask the basic research questions that could prevent unintended scenarios. I want my colleagues to know that this program will not fund risk assessment. It will not fund monitoring or the development or evaluation of risk-management strategies. Those activities in the area of applied research are not within the NSF mission. They are and should be supported by programs at USDA, EPA, and FDA, the entities charged with reviewing and regulating products being introduced into the market.

The program my amendment creates in NSF is not a substitute for increased funding in these other agencies; however, I do believe that the applied research programs of these agencies need to be increased also to address the questions the public is asking about these new products.

Before I close, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to several recent reports from the National Academy of Sciences on invasive species and agriculture biotechnology that have called for more research in this areas, including one released earlier this year. My amendment closely follows the recommendations contained in these academy reports. I also have a series of excerpts from these recent reports that I will insert into the RECORD at this time.

QUOTATIONS FROM NAS REPORTS

''The committee realizes that there remain some uncertainties regarding the use of pest-protected plants, including transgenic pest-protected plants. These uncertainties can lead to ambiguities in regulation and often force agencies to base their decisions on minimal data sets. Additional research should continue to refine and improve risk assessment methods and procedures and continue to develop additional data on both conventional and transgenic pest-protected plant products.'' (p. 139, NAS 2000)

''Research to increase our understanding of the population biology, genetics, and community ecology of the target pests should be conducted, so that more ecologically and evolutionary sustainable approaches to pest management with pest-protected plants can be developed. Knowledge of pests' roles in the larger biological community (for example, their role as food sources for non-target organisms or their roles as predators of other agriculturally relevant pests) will allow us to anticipate better the indirect effects of declines in the pests due to both conventional and transgenic pest-protected plants. Knowledge of the pest population biology will enable prediction of the types of pest-protection mechanisms that would most efficiently reduce a target organism's pest status and would help us to design more accurate resistance management plans.

Research to assess gene flow and its potential consequences should be conducted . . . more ecological and agricultural research is needed on the following: weed distribution and abundance (past and present), key factors that regulate weed population dynamics in managed and unmanaged areas, the likely impact of specific, novel resistance traits on weed abundance in managed and unmanaged areas, and rates at which resistance genes from the crop would be likely to spread among weed populations.'' (p. 140–141 NAS 2000)

RECOMMENDATIONS

''In cases when crucial scientific data are lacking about the potential impacts of gene

flow on wild or weedy relatives, the committee recommends delaying approval of deregulation pending sufficient data, establishing a scientifically rigorous monitoring program in key areas to check for undesirable effects of resistance transgenes after the transgenic pest-protected plant is commercialized, or restricting the initial areas where the plants can be grown.'' (p. 141–142 NAS 2000)

''APHIS jurisdiction has been restricted to the U.S. borders. However, in an era of globalization, environmental effects of transgenic crops on the ecosystems of developing countries will be an important component of risk analysis. As exemplified by the effects of the Green Revolution varieties of wheat and rice, novel crop genes often have indirect effects on the environment. These indirect effects can occur because the new crop traits enable changes in other agricultural practices and technologies that impact the environment. They also can indirectly affect vertical integration of agriculture and equality of access to food. Society cannot ignore the fact that people who lack food security often cause major effects on both agricultural and nonagricultural environments, so in a broad context the positive or negative effects of transgenes on human well-being can be seen as an environmental effect.

Environmental concerns raised by some of the first transgenic crops (e.g. gene flow, disruption of the genome, non-target effects) could be ameliorated by expanding our knowledge base in specific areas of molecular biology, ecology, and socioeconomic. Furthermore, such an expanded knowledge base could lead to the production of transgenic plants that would improve the environment. To increase knowledge in relevant areas the committee recommends substantial increases in public-sector investment in the following research areas: (1) improvement in precommercialization testing methods; (2) improvement in transgenic methods that will minimize risks; (3) research to identify transgenic plants traits that would provide environmental benefits; (4) research to develop transgenic plants with such traits; (5) research to improve the environmental risk characterization processes; and (6) research on the social, economic, and value-based issues affecting environmental impacts of transgenic crops.'' (p. 16 NAS 2002)

''The committee cannot presently judge whether extensive commercialization of transgenic—and other crops bearing novel traits—will significantly perturb agroecosystems or neighboring ecosystems because of major gaps in our knowledge of these systems.'' (p. 23 NAS 2002)

''The committee finds, . . . that specific types of transgenic and conventional crops can pose unique environmental hazards. Also, the committee finds that there are good arguments for regulating all transgenic crops. To be effective such a regulatory system must have an efficient and accurate method for rapidly evaluating all transgenic plants to separate those that require additional regulatory oversight from those that do not.'' (p. 52 NAS 2002)

''Perhaps more than anything else, the experience with commercialization of transgenic crops has revealed gaps in the knowledge base for understanding and measuring the environmental risks of crop production, irrespective of whether recombinant DNA technologies have been applied.'' p. 254 NAS 2002

''Formal research support in the United States for the study of environmental impacts of transgenic plants has been sparse.'' p. 255 NAS 2002

In reference to USDA's Biotechnology Risk Assessment Research Grants program:

''. . . The program has allocated no more than a few million dollars for research each year. Recently, the USDA's Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems (IFAFS) program has included a competition for funding research, education, and extension on the management of environmental risks of agricultural biotechnology. Both funding programs have substantial limitations—BRARGP because its focus is only on assessment and because the total amount of funding is so low; IFAFS because the focus is only for risk management and the funding program itself is anticipated to have a short life. Neither program funds monitoring or research related to monitoring.

Reserch on the environmental impacts of transgenic plants can be accomplished through other funding sources if the research questions asked have general significance. For example, issues directly associated with the impacts of transgenic plants may often be associated with critical, but largely unanswered, questions in other fields. For example, whether or not the introgression of pest resistance transgenes into wild populations will result in the evolution of weediness or invasiveness is directly associated with important questions in population biology regarding the genetic and ecological causes and correlates of invasiveness (Traynor and Westwood 1999).'' (p. 255 NAS 2002)

''Recommendation 7.3: Significant public-sector investment is called for in the following research areas: improvement in risk analysis methodologies and protocols; improvement in transgenic methods that will reduce risks and improve benefits to the environment; research to develop and improve monitoring for effects in the environment; and research on the social, economic, and value-based issues affecting environmental impacts of transgenic crops.'' (p. 259 NAS 2002)

National Research Council. 2002. ''Environmental Effects of Transgenic Plants: The Scope and Adequacy of Regulation'' National Academy Press, Washington, DC.

National Research Council 2000. ''Genetically Modified Pest-Protected Plants: Science and Regulation. Washington, DC National Academy Press.

Mr. Chairman, we all live in a world in which we move things around with increasing frequency and speed. So we must make at least a modest investment in understanding how those movements are likely to affect our world. That is why I am asking my chairman and my colleagues to support this amendment, because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we must reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment from my very good friend from California. I certainly agree with the gentlewoman that the National Science Foundation should conduct basic research that will enable us to understand better the impacts of biotechnology and other biological research on organisms and on the environment. In fact, NSF already conducts such research. Indeed, this House passed a bill just a few weeks ago that charged NSF, again, with conducting such research. That bill introduced by myself and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), had been approved by the Committee on Science. So I wholeheartedly endorse the idea that NSF should fund this kind of research and they will.

My problems with the amendment are narrower, but still significant. First the numbers in the amendment are entirely arbitrary. They may be too large; they may be too small. We have no idea. We have never looked into it. In an area this important, I do not think we should be pulling numbers out of thin air.

Second, NSF funds a lot of different scientific disciplines and subdisciplines. We chose not to pick out many of these specific areas in this bill for congressionally or politically targeted spending levels because once we go down that road, there is no end to it. We want to give the foundation, the scientific community the maximum flexibility that has served us so well.

So generally we have limited ourselves to initiatives proposed by the President in areas on which the House has previously acted. The kind of research that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is highlighting is important, but not necessarily more important than areas of research we are not citing by name in this bill. We need to limit the number of areas of science that we single out for set-asides in this bill.

Let me say in conclusion, and maybe thirdly, I have a process problem with this amendment.

□ 1500

We have worked on this bill in a bipartisan manner for almost 2 years. The bill passed unanimously in committee because of lengthy bipartisan discussions. I am not eager to add new issues on the House floor. We are poised now to pass a bill that can move swiftly through both the House and the other body, and I think many of us do not want to add anything that has even the potential to slow our progress.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. It is unnecessary and could slow passage of an important measure, and I will work with the gentlewoman to ensure that the area of science she is seeking to protect continues to receive its due from the National Science Foundation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, two things. First, this would have been part of the debate in the committee had I not been asked not to bring it up in committee but to bring it as an amendment to the floor, and I was asked by the majority party to do that. So please be clear, this is not something I did not want to bring to the committee.

Second of all, when my colleague talks about the funding being arbitrary, our decision on this funding came from the same place that our whole committee's decision to double the funding for NSF came from. We do not know how much money we need. We know we need more, and I know with my amendment we need something. So I want to get started and the

public wants to get started so that we can scientifically decide what is good and what is not good.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, to make it clear, it is somewhat of a different amendment than the gentlewoman submitted in the Committee on Science, but even more and above that, it seems to me like we should agree that if we can leave NSF and the scientific community and the peer review process to do and decide on these initiatives and how much is reasonable, the legislation that we passed recently by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and myself does not say we are going in one area or the other. It says do more research. Let us leave that up to the scientific community in deciding how much money should be spent in any particular area of this biological research.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of this particular amendment, but I would like to ask a specific question relative to an area of research that might be related to this program, and so I offer to the sponsor this question. Is it the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. WOOLSEY) anticipation that this particular biosafety research program would provide research that would better understand why plants and animals become invasive pests when they are introduced in new habitats?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. RIVERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly my intention.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her response.

I note that the National Academy of Sciences recently released a report called Predicting Invasions of Nonindigenous Plants and Plant Pests. In that document they state, ''In spite of a long history of interest in biological invasion, scientific inquiry in invasion is still nascent. Progress in understanding and predicting invasions will depend on how well the insights of investigators with diverse training can be coalesced and directed to decipher the myriad combinations of immigrant species, new ranges, and novel circumstances that can produce a biological invasion. The last 10 years has seen the emergence of a broad consensus that the prediction of biological invasion is a field presenting national need. It will take some time, however, to generate the predictive principles on which policy-makers, regulators, the scientific community, and the public can have confidence.''

They go on to say that, ''The challenge of constructing a scientific basis for predicting the risk associated with nonindigenous species needs to be met by a significant national effort, including other agencies within the USDA, other branches of the Federal Government responsible for research and land management, agricultural and natural resource agencies of State governments and the scientific community at large.''

I am very pleased to support this bill, with emphasis on invasive species, because in Michigan we have a terrible problem. When the zebra mussels hitched a ride in ship ballast water and were introduced to the Great Lakes and other bodies of water, their populations exploded. These animals are continuing to cause serious ecological and economic damage in my region, and I believe we need much more research to understand the basic biology and ecology of this organism if we are ever to hope to control it.

I also believe that we need much more information to help us identify potentially invasive species before they are introduced to new ecosystems. We could avoid a great deal of harm and expense if we were able to devise means to evaluate the potential invasiveness of new plants and animals.

I believe that the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. WOOLSEY) proposal is a sound one that will bring us forward in the debate around invasive species and understanding our ecology in general. I urge Members to support this amendment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) might also be relating to this, but in the bioterrorism bill that we passed a couple of weeks ago, we did include over $190 million to USDA, additional funding to the Department of Energy, specifically for this purpose. So that bioterrorism bill included a lot of the goals that I hear some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle suggest we need.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I know that the author and the supporters of this amendment are very sincere. They feel very strongly about the issues, but I want to clarify something here for the rest of the Members.

We are really not talking about zebra mussels in this amendment, and we are not talking about purple loosestrife. What we are really talking about is whether or not we are going to take actions on the floor of the House of Representatives to limit the amount of research that can be done on biology and new plant species and things that are happening in biotechnology.

What that says is we are not spending enough on that area now, and the truth of the matter is there is nothing in this authorization today that would limit the amount that the National Science Foundation could spend on these kinds of programs, but it is, in fact, a way of tinkering. So this is redundant. It is unneeded and, worse than that, it is politicizing what I think has been a very nonpolitical markup and as we have worked through this process.

Historically, we in Congress, I think, have done a very good job of not trying to politicize or get our fingers into these kinds of decisions. We have had an awful lot of research about biology and new biotechnology, and all of it has come to this same conclusion, and that is, that the work that is being done in both the government-funded labs, as well as in private labs, is both safe and has no detrimental impact on the environment.

We have had all kinds of scares. What the authors are trying to do really is they are once again introducing the idea that we can somehow disprove the negative. They know that that cannot happen, and this is a toe in the door for some of these researchers to say, well, the answer, of course, is we have to have more money, but understand that when those particular researchers, attempting to disprove a negative which cannot be disproved, when they take more money, it comes at the expense of other important research.

I believe this research has to go forward. I think the USDA, the National Science Foundation, other groups that are doing this kind of research, they are doing it with very good scientists who understand that there are consequences, but more importantly, if we try to limit the work that is done in biotechnology, what we are working on today is developing plant species that can actually cure diseases.

That is amazing. It is wonderful. We should not try to stymie that kind of research. We are developing new plant species which are much more resistant to pests and other problems they might encounter so we can use less in terms of pesticides on those plants. That again is a wonderful discovery.

And also understand, most of the food that we eat today is a result of biotechnology. The Native Americans did a wonderful job in creating what we now know is corn. They actually developed that from what was formerly known as maize. The potato was something that was actually crossbred and developed by the American Indian. All that we enjoy, much of what we enjoy today in terms of things that we take for granted, were developed with biotechnology.

This is a thinly veiled attempt to politicize what has been a very nonpolitical markup, and the way that the Congress has dealt with it, I think it is a bad idea. It sets a very bad precedent because if this amendment is adopted, I promise my colleagues we will see more and more amendments by Members attempting to advance a political cause they believe in. I think it is a very big mistake, and I hope the Members will join me in opposing this amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding to me. I have two responses to the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. SMITH) objections to my amendment.

First, in talking about the changes that differed from what my amendment was in committee and to what we have brought to the floor, my changes were based on the committee's objections. So I came here prepared to improve upon what we had talked about earlier.

In the amendment in committee, we had the funding come from a small account in the plant genome program, and now my amendment would allow the NSF director to decide where within an $11 billion research account my $35 million program could be funded. That is not a lot of money within a large account, and so I wanted to make sure my colleague knew why that had changed.

It is $15 million in the first year of the bill, $20 million in the second year of the bill, and nothing specified in the third year because we have required a report from the NSF with their recommended levels for future years. So we are not assuming beyond the first 2 years.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) has said that his bill already covers this, his bill that I voted for, H.R. 2051, to establish plant genome research centers which also authorizes research on basic research and dissemination of information on the ecological and other consequences of genetically engineered plants. His does that. My amendment expands upon the gentleman's bill, and my program covers plants and animals that would not be restricted to research on genetically engineered plants and animals. So it expands his good ideas but makes it larger.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a couple of reactions, one supporting this concept. I am informed that the language of the gentlewoman's amendment limits the amount that can be spent on this effort, and who is to say it should be more, and I just suggest rather than let politicians deciding, let us let the scientific community make that decision, not limit it or pre-guess what is the right amount.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond that I think I am sitting on the wrong side of the aisle when it is this side of the aisle who would limit a budget, and it is the gentleman's side of the aisle challenging that.

So this is the beginning of something that the public wants us to do, and I think we are making a great mistake if we do not vote for this because it is the right thing to do, and it is the environmentally friendly thing to do, and it would help our public know what is safe and what is not safe by having scientific studies, not emotional rhetoric, about what is going on with these programs.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise to enthusiastically support the distinguished gentlewoman from California's (Ms. WOOLSEY) amendment, and let me say to the proponents, this is a good bill, and I appreciate the leadership of the Committee on Science for the collaborative way in which this bill, the authorization of the National Science Foundation, has been done.

Let me comment that the importance of science in America could not be more important now. When we begin to talk about homeland security and the new challenges that we will face in the 21st century to ensure safety in our community, science is important. Training of girls and boys and the training of minorities in science, preparing them for the 21st century, funding those kinds of institutions, providing such programs is important.

That is why I connect the value of the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. WOOLSEY) amendment because it is a simple, common sense amendment. If we could sort of move away from issues of politicizing and depoliticizing, let me say what this amendment does.

It simply provides a steady stream of funding to study the impact of biotechnology on plants and ecosystems where there is not.

□ 1515

I would say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) that we all supported his legislation that was recently passed: 2051. In that legislation, the gentleman did in fact earmark, and that is simply what is going on here. What we are responding to, however, is our instructor, our instructor is the National Academy of Sciences, which has called for implicit and significant increased funding for the particular aspect of the Woolsey amendment.

So, in fact, what is occurring is that the Woolsey amendment supports the National Academy of Sciences to provide monies for this kind of research. In fact, it has recommended this kind of research to study the ecological impact of plants bred conventionally and through biotechnology.

I would also simply say to my good friend from Minnesota that depoliticizing the issue is what we are doing. We are not politicizing it. What we are simply trying to do is to give the funding stream to get good science in order to be able to regulate properly. And that means if we get the research, the basic research, we know how to do the job.

I believe the American public is more than prepared now to understand that this is not a question of limiting the funds. The Woolsey amendment does not limit it; it gives it a funding stream. If we need more monies, I am sure that with an intelligent response by the Congress we can add more money. So this is not a limit. This is providing a continuous funding stream in order to be able to do the kind of research.

Might I just restate the utilization of H.R. 2051, the bill of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), was to establish plant genome research centers and which authorize research on basic research and dissemination of information on the ecological and other consequences of genetically engineered plants. This program would cover plants and animals and would not be restricted to research on genetically engineered plants and animals. This, however, has to be expanded; and the Woolsey amendment, I am very glad to say, goes a step further and begins to do the research that is necessary, the impact of biotechnology on plants and the ecosystems.

I close this by simply saying this, Mr. Chairman. It is interesting how as we mature and learn we find out that what we used to ridicule we find is truth. It is interesting that the present administration and others who support their policies ridiculed global warming, but just the other day those representatives of this administration put forward a report that said, you know what, global warming exists. Good science tells us that global warming exists and we have a problem. Interestingly enough, the present administration had to concede. And, of course, we understand that it was refuted and that individuals who put forward the report were called a bunch of bureaucrats. But truth will find a way.

This is what the Woolsey amendment offers to do, gives us the truth and the information that allows us to go forward and make an effective determination on how we can regulate this particular issue. And I would believe that our instructor, the National Academy of Sciences, could not be wrong in insisting that we need a significant increase in funding. I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment. I do not even rise reluctantly to oppose it, because I think it is ill advised.

It is ill advised for several reasons. The type of research that is being outlined here is already being conducted, not just in the NSF but in various other agencies that are interested in it, the Department of Agriculture, the EPA; and I am sure NIH is looking at some aspects of it as well.

But my main reason for objection has to do with the history of the National Science Foundation. The National

Science Foundation arose out of a report written by Vannevar Bush at the request of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1945. That report set out the basic structure of the National Science Foundation, and the basic idea of that report was that this would be an agency that would do scientific research, the priorities would be set by the scientists based on the scientific evidence, and that the research to be conducted would be peer reviewed by other scientists so that we would have good science done in this country.

It has an outstanding record. We have heard already that we have had over 100 Nobel prizes awarded to people who have received National Science Foundation grants. The basic idea is that the Congress would keep its hands off of specific appropriations for specific projects. It is very disappointing that this bill, which received unanimous support in committee and appears to have received unanimous support in debate on the floor, has this introduced where we are trying to earmark money for a specific pet project.

I can tell my colleagues that I can quickly list 20 pet projects that I think the NSF should be conducting research on and that they should be spending more money on. But the idea behind the NSF is that we do not allocate that money here, particularly in authorization bills; that, in fact, the work done there is based on the scientific judgments collectively gathered from the scientific community in this Nation.

It is entirely inappropriate for us to sit here on the House floor in an authorizing bill and try to designate funding for a particular project which a few Members of this body believe are important above and beyond all the other scientific research that we are considering in this Nation.

I object to this amendment. I hope that it is defeated, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARDIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I would like to point out, in responding to the statement that we are doing this already, that I have a quote on page 255 of the National Academy of Sciences Report of 2002, and I quote ''Formal research support in the United States for the study of environmental impacts on transgenic plants has been sparse.'' In other words, we are not doing enough.

And in responding to the statement of my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), that we do not identify how we spend NSF funds, we just give them a big pot of money, we do have other programs that are identified. We spend money on advanced technological education, on Noyce scholarships, math and science scholarship programs, minority-serving institutions and undergraduate programs, and the Presidential Science Teacher awards, for example. That is just a list of the few things that we do.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARDIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, the items the gentlewoman has mentioned are all, if I heard them correctly, are all in the educational area, and are not directing research within the agency.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. CARDIN. I yield once again to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would respond that they are still in NSF, and that is what we are saying. The gentleman is saying we do not identify programs that we invest money in other than just general funds. We do decide what is important under NSF when we choose to.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment, and let me just say that I have a great deal of fear that the money that is going into science is quite often politicized, and there is evidence of that around. I think the amendment that the gentlewoman is suggesting would lead in that direction and we should be very wary of these types of earmarks.

What I think the gentlewoman would actually do is create a situation where money was earmarked for this particular biotechnology type of research and the word would go out that if anyone wants to create scares about biotechnology they should come and get their grant because this is what this money is for.

We have seen the same sort of thing happen before. We saw it happen with global warming. My fellow colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), suggested there has been a ''change'' in administration policy on global warming. Well, I am not sure what that change in policy is, but it is very clear that that issue has been so politicized by the introduction of tax dollars through the various National Science Foundation, NASA, et cetera, that the public has not been getting pure science, but it has been getting politicized science.

In the early 1980s, there was a consensus, and in fact there were hearings in this Congress, in our committee, reaffirming the great threat that the global climate change posed to humankind. In fact, we had hearings in which the Democratic leaders of the committees at that time, because the Democrats controlled the House, they controlled the committees, made statements about the horrible threat of this global climate change. The only trouble was the climate change they were talking about and the scientists they brought in to verify it were warning us of global cooling.

Some of those scientists, I might add, are now on the payroll advocating that we have to fear global warming. Now, all of that in a 20-year time period. They reversed themselves on this important issue in a 20-year period. Now, supposedly the global warming trend and the global cooling trend, whatever it is, has been going on for thousands and thousands of years, yet they reversed themselves in a 20-year period as to what the government had to emphasize in order to save humankind.

If we had taken their prescriptions, obviously we would have been going in exactly the wrong direction. And I would predict in about 5 years from now there will be some other major revelation to the scientific community, as government grants are given in this way or that way; and we might find that it is neither global warming nor global cooling, but something to do with the Earth on its axis or something going towards the Moon or the sun, or something else we deserve to spend billions of dollars and direct it towards the scientists who will be able to warn us about it.

Let me just note that we have seen the glaciers in our country and other countries receding for about 100,000 years now. There has been climate change in the world, and it has been getting warmer for hundreds of thousands of years. Yet in order to prove that humankind in the last 5,000, or actually the last 500 years is causing this global climate change, we are spending billions and billions of science dollars.

We have got to quit politicizing science. This amendment, I believe, goes in exactly the wrong direction. But let me note this. Politicized science is probably the worst threat that we have right now to understanding the actual perils that might face us in the future.

I still remember the ''Global 2000 Report,'' and I would recommend that my colleagues read the ''Global 2000 Report'' that was put out in 1980, financed of course by tax dollars. The ''Global 2000 Report,'' I believe, warned us against global cooling, but my colleagues can check into that. I do not remember that precisely, but I do remember they said we would be totally out of oil by the year 2000 and that gasoline would cost about $150 a gallon, or something like that, and all of our natural resources would be depleted. In other words, there was this great threat, this great scare that was put out in the ''Global 2000 Report,'' and every one of their conclusions were wrong, now that we have passed the year 2000. Do my colleagues know why it was wrong? It is because it was politicized science.

I think that we have to, and we are dealing with this committee and we are dealing with our expenditures, we have to go out of our way, bend over backwards to ensure that we are not politicizing science; that we are not taking up a trendy issue and asking the scientific community to verify it in order

to get government grants. That is why I would oppose the Woolsey amendment.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I would like to respond to the gentleman from California when he talks about biotechnology research and global climate reports that our President and his administration put forth a report this weekend to the U.N. acknowledging global climate change, and telling the world to adapt, just get used to it.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, what are we going to tell the monarch butterflies when they are having to adapt to genetically modified corn? They cannot adapt. They are dying. We have to look into what we can do about that, and that is what this amendment is about. It is about good science, not about emotions.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I generally agree with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), but I do have to correct one thing the gentlewoman said, the President and the administration put out a report. Actually, the administration put out a report. The President seemed to be quite surprised by it, not to the point of actually reading it, because I think it would take more than that to get him to read it; but I was struck by the President's bemusement by the report.

So just because the EPA and a group of scientists have said something does not mean that the President chooses to associate himself with it. That does not detract from the validity of the report, but it did seem to me to be a rather interesting precedent being set of a President expressing his surprise that a report issued in his administration's name ought to be noted.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will count for a quorum.

Does the gentlewoman withdraw the point of order?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry. Is an insufficient number standing, in your opinion, for a recorded vote?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman withdraws her point of order.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 259, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

AYES—165

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—259

Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Menendez
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Blagojevich
Gilchrest
Hilliard
LaFalce
Meeks (NY)
Morella
Peterson (PA)
Riley
Slaughter
Traficant

□ 1557

Messrs. SAXTON, HALL of Ohio, SIMMONS, SHOWS, CRAMER, Mrs. THURMAN and Messrs. RYUN of Kansas, CRENSHAW and COX changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Florida and Mr. ORTIZ changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair,

Mr. BONILLA, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4664) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 432, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 397, noes 25, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

AYES—397

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—25

Collins
Deal
Flake
Herger
Hostettler
Hyde
Jones (NC)
Kerns
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Norwood
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Stearns
Stump
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Weldon (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Blagojevich
Callahan
Gilchrest
Hilliard
LaFalce
Meeks (NY)
Morella
Ortiz
Peterson (PA)
Riley
Slaughter
Traficant

□ 1615

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, on final passage of H.R. 4664, Investing in America's Future Act, I was on the House Floor and cast an "aye" vote for H.R. 4664.

I later learned my vote was not recorded. I wanted to advise the House that had my vote been recorded, I would have voted "aye" on final passage for H.R. 4664.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 209, 210, 211, and 212. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on each of them. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the permanent RECORD immediately following this vote.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4664, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2143, PERMANENT DEATH TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–494) on the resolution (H. Res. 435) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2143) to make the repeal of the estate tax permanent, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I give notice of my intention to raise a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX of the rules of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the President's constitutional duty is to faithfully execute the laws of the United States, and